UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

NEW ENGLAND DISTRICT

In the Matter of:

PUBLIC HEARING:

RE: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

CAPE WIND ENERGY PROJECT

NANTUCKET SOUND, MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts Institute of Technology 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Room 10-250 Cambridge, MA 02139-4307

Thursday December 16, 2004

The above entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to Notice at 7:00 p.m.

BEFORE:

Colonel Thomas Koning Commander and District Engineer

Larry Rosenberg, Moderator Chief, Public Affairs

James Hunt, Director Mass. Environmental Policy Act Office

Karen Adams, Chief Permits and Enforcement Branch

APEX Reporting (617) 426-3077

\underline{I} \underline{N} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{X}

PANEL	PAGE
Larry Rosenberg, Chief Public Affairs New England District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	8
Colonel Thomas Koning Commander and District Engineer New England District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	12
James Hunt, Director Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act Office	16
Karen Adams, Chief Permits and Enforcement Branch, New England District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	20
SPEAKERS:	PAGE
Sen. Robert O'Leary	34
Rep. Matthew Patrick	36
Rep. Doug Petersen	39
Rep. Paul Loscocco	41
Lee Mondale for Rep. James Eldridge	44
Fred Schlicner for Rep. Paul Donato	47
John Crisley for Rep. Patricia Jehlen	49
James Liedell	51
Mark Breslow for Susan Falcoff	53
George Byrant	55
Mark Weissman	58

\underline{I} \underline{N} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{X}

SPEAKERS:	PAGE
Lt. Col. William Tyminski	60
Mark Amorello	62
Michael Baker	65
Charles Gifford	66
Jane Bright	69
Barbara Durkin	71
Shaun Breau	74
Jules Clark	75
Erik Gehring	77
Larry Chretien	79
Glenn Barnes	81
Jonathan Davis	83
William Griswold	85
Matthew Palmer	87
Jonathan Davids	89
Liz Argo	90
Carl Freeman	92
Christopher Stimpson	94
Jed Thorp	97
Judy Chang	99
Seth Kaplan	101
Paul Levie	104

APEX Reporting (617) 426-3077

152

154

Madeleine Scammel

Constantine Jamoylenko

\underline{I} \underline{N} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{X}

SPEAKERS:	PAGE	
Susan Giordano	156	
Smilia Marvosh	159	
Tedd Saunders	161	
Stephanie Doiron	163	
Pete Lowell	165	
Richard Thornton	168	
Lori Segall	170	
Deborah Donovan	173	
Neil Good	175	
Susan Nickerson	178	
Stephen Macausland	180	
Marlon Banta	183	
Niaz Dorry	185	
Eric Chivian	188	
Patrick O'Shea	190	
Charles Fiesel	192	
Michael Charney	195	
Gerard Desautels	197	
Jennifer Baldwin	200	
Roberta Murphy	202	
Diana Tacker	204	
Malia Milligan	206	

\underline{I} \underline{N} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{X}

SPEAKERS:	<u>PAGE</u>
Audra Parker	208
Maria Simoneau	210
Allison Field-Juma	213
Marion Springer	215
Lisa Augusto	217
Sara Hedges for Brigita Rasys	218
Michael O'Leksak	220
David Bergeron	221
Colin Peppard	224
Aditya Nochur	226
Susan Swords	228
Jason Sapienza	230
James Clark	232
Stephen Kaiser	233
Jonathan Haughton	236
Bernard Gallagher	238
Ernie Corrigan	239
Joy Marzolf	241
Lincoln Baxter	243
David Shakespeare	246
Rob Bussiere	248
Roderic Baltz	250

<u>PROCEEDINGS</u>

(7:00 p.m.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Good evening and welcome to this National Environmental Policy Act public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Cape Wind Energy Project that will lead to a decision by the Federal Government on a permit application submitted by Cape Wind Associates for their proposal to build a wind energy project in Nantucket Sound, Massachusetts.

This Corps of Engineers public hearing is being conducted with participation from the Commonwealth MEPA office.

My name is Larry Rosenberg. I'm the chief of Public Affairs for the United States Army Corps of Engineers in New England, and I will be your moderator and facilitator this evening.

Before we begin, I would like to thank you for getting involved in this environmental review process. You see, we're here tonight to listen to your comments, to understand your concerns, and to provide you an opportunity to put your thoughts on the record, should you care to do so. This forum is yours.

Our hearing officer this evening is

Colonel Thomas Koning, the Commander and District

Engineer for the United States Army Corps of

Engineers of New England. Should you need copies

of the public notice, the hearing procedures, or

any other pertinent information, it is available

right between these two doors, right before the

registration tables.

The agenda for this hearing is following this introduction. Colonel Koning will address this hearing. He'll be followed by Mr. James Hunt, the Director of the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act office, who will discuss the involvement of the Commonwealth and the State's processes.

Then the Corps project manager,

Ms. Karen Kirk Adams, will provide an overview of
the Corps' processes to date to compile and
publish the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Following that short presentation, we will be
receiving your comments according to our protocol.

Please, feel free to bring up any topics that you feel that need to be discussed on the record. Now, I assure you that all of the

comments will be addressed during this environmental review process. And as you can see, there are quite a few here tonight. So, I'm going to ask everybody to keep to that two minute window that has been identified for this hearing.

For your convenience, an additional stenographer is available near the registration area, should you wish to provide comment on the record, but without the imposed time restriction, rather than making this formal presentation here tonight. These statements, along with any written statement submitted, will receive equal consideration with those presented at the microphone.

Now, it is very important that you know that no decision has been made by the Army Corps of Engineers with regards to this permit application. Furthermore, the Corps of Engineers is not here to defend any aspect of the proposed activity; we are here to listen to what's on your mind concerning this permit application.

Before we begin, I'd like to remind you the importance of filling out those little white cards that we forced you to wait in line for.

These cards serve two purposes: first, they let us know that you're interested in the Draft EIS so we can keep you informed; second, they provide me a list of those who wish to speak this evening.

If you did not fill out a card, but wish to speak this evening. If you did not complete a card, but you wish to speak or receive future information regarding the permit application or the federal processes, one will be provided at the registration desk.

Now, one additional comment, we are here to receive your comments and not to enter into any discussion of those comments or to reach any conclusions. Any questions you have should be directed to the record and not to the individuals on the panel.

Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, Col. Thomas Koning.

COL. KONING: I'd like to welcome you today to this public hearing on the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement for the Cape Wind
Energy Project permit application submitted by
Cape Wind Associates for their proposal to build a

wind and energy project in Nantucket Sound, Massachusetts.

I would, also, like to thank you for involving yourself in this environmental review process. Please feel free to bring up any topics and issues that you feel need to be discussed on the record. I assure you that all of your comments will be addressed during the process.

I am Colonel Thomas Koning, the

Commander of the New England District of the U.S.

Army Corps of Engineers, and our headquarters is
in Concord, Massachusetts. Other Corps
representatives with me tonight, a few of them are

Ms. Karen Adams, our project manager; and Larry

Rosenberg, who will serve as our facilitator for
this evening. Also joining me tonight is Mr. Jim

Hunt, the Director of the Massachusetts

Environmental Policy Act Office.

Tonight's hearing is being conducted as part of the Corps of Engineers regulatory program solely to listen to your comments. This hearing is being conducted as part of the Federal National Environmental Policy Act requirements and the Corps of Engineers regulatory responsibilities to

seek out public comment during the Draft -- of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Our authorities are statutory and they include Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, often referred to as NEPA.

I would like to briefly review the Corps of Engineers' responsibility in this process.

First, the Corps' jurisdiction in this case is Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act.

That authorizes the Corps to regulate structures in the navigable waters of the United States. The Corps' New England District received a permit application from Cape Wind Associates in late

November 2001 for a Section 10 permit for the installation and operation of an offshore wind energy project in the federal and state waters off the coast of Massachusetts in Horseshoe Shoals, in Nantucket Sound.

Second, the detailed regulations that explain the procedure for evaluating permit applications and unauthorized work is Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 320 through 330.

Third, the Corps' decision rests upon several important factors to include, in addition to those aforementioned regulatory and statutory authorities I just gave, our decision to issue a permit will be based on the evaluation of the probable impacts of proposed activity on the public interest.

Our decision will reflect the national concern for, both, the protection and utilization of important resources. The benefits that may reasonably accrue from the proposal must be balanced against the reasonably foreseen detriments. All factors which are relevant to the proposal will be considered prior to our making a decision about those factors.

They include conservation, economics, aesthetics, the general environmental concerns, wetlands, historic properties, fish and wildlife values, flood hazards, flood plain, land uses, navigation, shoreline erosion and accretion, recreation, water supply and conservation, water quality, energy needs, safety, food and fiber production, mineral needs, considerations of property ownership and, in general, the welfare of

the people.

Additionally, as part of our regulatory responsibilities, a number of other federal laws apply, including the National Environmental Policy Act. Underneath, the federal agencies must ensure that environmental information is available to itself and to the public before decisions are reached. This hearing is part of that review, and your comments will help us in reaching a decision.

The record of this hearing will remain open, and written comments may be submitted tonight or by mail and e-mail until February 24, 2005. All comments will receive equal consideration.

Lastly, to date no decision has been made by the Corps of Engineers with regard to this permit. It is my responsibility to evaluate all of the impacts prior to my decision, and in order to accomplish that, I need your input.

It us critical to this public process that your voice is heard, and I thank you in advance for taking the time to involve yourselves in this environmental review and providing us information that is necessary in order for the

Corps of Engineers to make an informed decision regarding the Cape Wind Energy Project.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. Ladies and gentleman, Mr. James Hunt.

MR. HUNT: Good evening, and thank you for participating in this important environmental review proceeding for the Cape Wind project.

My name is Jim Hunt, and I serve as assistant secretary for the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, and I administer the Environmental Policy Act on behalf of secretary, Ellen Roy Herzfelder.

The MEPA office is not required to convene or participate in public hearings during the environmental review process; however, we are participating in these Army Corps hearings because we recognize there is tremendous interest in this project from many different perspectives, and we want to hear from you.

I want to thank Colonel Koning, Karen Adams, Larry Rosenberg, and the other Army Corps staff for allowing MEPA to participate in these hearings and for their assistance throughout the

review of this project.

The Massachusetts Environmental Policy
Act requires the public study and disclosure of
potential impacts, as well as the development of
feasible mitigation measures for a proposed
project. It does not pass judgment on whether a
project can or should receive a particular permit,
for those decisions are left to the permitting
agencies.

MEPA review, however, occurs before permitting agencies act to ensure that state agencies and the public understand the full range of potential impacts that may result from agency actions.

The review of the Cape Wind project commenced with the filing of an environmental notification form in November 2001, and was followed by a scope for an Environmental Impact Report that was issued in April of 2002.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement that's before us, was prepared by the Army Corps of Engineers to meet federal requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act. The document also serves as the Draft EIR under MEPA.

MEPA review is required for this project pursuant to 301 CMR 11.03(7)(b)(4) of the MEPA regulations because the project involves the construction of a new electric transmission line greater than one mile in length with a capacity of 69 kV or more.

The portion of the project within

Massachusetts will require several permits,
including a 401 water quality certificate and a

Chapter 91 license from the Department of
Environmental Protection, approval from the

Massachusetts Energy Facility Citing Board, a
construction permit from the Massachusetts Highway

Department, an Order of Conditions from the

Barnstable and Yarmouth Conservation Commissions
and, potentially, a superseding Order of
Conditions from the DEP, if one or both of the
local orders is appealed. In addition, the

Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management office will
conduct a federal consistency review of the
project.

The project is also being reviewed in accordance with an Memorandum of Understanding with the Cape Cod Commission that was established

due to the extensive overlap between MEPA and the Cape Cod Commission.

While the Army Corps of Engineers, MEPA and the Cape Cod Commission are conducting joint review for public convenience and administrative purposes, it is very important to note that each agency retains independent review authority over matters within each agency's respective jurisdiction.

Finally, I want to inform you that, at the request of Secretary Ellen Roy Herzfelder and the consent of the project proponent, the common deadline for this project was extended under MEPA to run concurrently with the Army Corps deadline of February 24, 2005.

Additional information about the MEPA process and how to comment can be found on the materials in the lobby or on our Web site at www.mass.gov\envir\mepa.

Thank you again, and I look forward to receiving your comments tonight.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

Ladies and gentleman, Mrs. Karen Kirk

Adams.

MS. ADAMS: The Draft EIS/EIR addresses the potential impacts of public interest factors identified by the scoping process and is intended to fulfill the regional, state, and federal environmental assessment requirements. The summary brochure is available at the registration area.

We started our review by inviting input from the general public, in addition to the seventeen federal, state, and regional agencies who are asked to participate as cooperating agencies, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and policy guidance from the President's Council on the grounds of Quality.

Many of the agencies have jurisdiction over aspects of the project, and their participation in a combined EIS/EIR fosters efficiency in the project review process. Other agencies agreed to participate as cooperating agency to provide technical expertise.

We're the lead federal agency because of the Corps' jurisdiction under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, which provides for federal regulation of any work in or affecting navigable waters of the United States. We direct the applicant to provide the information necessary for federal review.

The Corps EIS fulfilling the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act is one of many processes that must be implemented prior to a final permit decision by the Corps. The Corps is required to address several federal requirements, including the Endangered Species Act and the National Historic Preservation Act.

These are just some of the approvals needed prior to the start of construction. There will be others, such as the Oil Spill Response Plan, that will be required by Mineral Management Service prior to the start of operations.

Cape Wind Associates has applied for a permit, under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, to install 130 wind turbine generators within a 24 square mile area of Nantucket Sound. This will be 4.7 miles south of Yarmouth, 9 miles from Edgartown, and 13.8 miles from Nantucket.

Each monopile support structure will have a 16 foot diameter with a total of

approximately one acre of sea bottom displaced by the 130 structures. The rotor hub would be approximately 246 feet above the water surface, and the total height, including the rotor, would be approximately 417 feet.

Cables are proposed to run between these structures to an electric service platform. This platform would be 100 feet by 200 feet. Two cables buried a minimum of 6 feet below the seabed would bring the power to the landfall location at New Hampshire Avenue, in Yarmouth. The cables would then continue through local streets to the existing NStar transmission lines in Barnstable.

The permit application plans are included in the public notice which is available in the registration area. After our initial review of the application, we determined that an Environmental Impact Statement would be needed in December of 2001, and we then proceeded with the public scoping of the EIS.

Public scoping hearings were held in the spring of 2002. We greatly appreciated the opportunity to participate in a series of stakeholders' meetings sponsored by the

Massachusetts Technology Collaborative in 2002 to help us gain a better understanding of local issues and concerns.

We held our own public information meetings in November 2002 and October 2003 to provide updates on our review process. We have now brought all this information together in a Draft EIS. The public comment period began on November 9th and will continue through February 24, 2005.

Our next step is to catalog all these comments and address each issue that is presented in these comments. We will continue to work with the appropriate cooperating agencies and the applicant to address these issues. The Corps of Engineers will carefully consider all comments received.

Following this review, we will prepare a final EIS. Thirty days later, the Corps can prepare a Record of Decision. This will contain our decision as to whether to deny the permit, issue a permit, or issue the permit with conditions.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, Karen.

Ladies and gentleman, it is crucial to this public process that your voice is heard, and we are here to listen. To listen to your comments, to understand your concerns, and provide you an opportunity to put your thoughts on the record, should you care to do so.

The hearing tonight will be conducted in a manner that all who desire to express their views will be given an opportunity to do so. To preserve the right of all to express their views, I ask that there be no interruptions.

When you came in, copies of the public notice and the procedures to be followed at this hearing were available. If you did not receive these, both are still available at the registration area. I will not read either the procedures or the public notice, but both will be entered into the record.

A transcript of this hearing is being prepared and the record will remain open and written comments may be submitted tonight by e-mail or by mail up until, including February 24, 2005. All comments receive equal consideration.

Anyone that you know of that cannot attend, but still wish to send comments, please. And they should forward those to our headquarters in Concord, Massachusetts.

Lastly, I would like to re-emphasize that the Corps of Engineers has made no decision regarding this permit. It is our responsibility to fully evaluate the proposed activity and its impact prior to any decisions. And in order to accomplish that, we need your input.

Again, we are here to receive your comments and not to enter into discussion of those comments or to reach any conclusions. Any questions you have should be directed to the record and not to the individuals on the panel.

And once again, no banners or signs are permitted in this hearing room.

Sir, if there is no objection, I will now dispense with the reading of the public notice of the hearing and have it entered into the record.

PUBLIC NOTICE

Cape Wind Associates, LLC, 75 Arlington

Street, Suite 704, Boston, MA has requested a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permit under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 to install 130 wind turbine generators and associated cable. This work is proposed in Nantucket Sound with the cable landfall at New Hampshire Avenue, Yarmouth, The wind turbine generators would be spaced 1/3-1/2 mile apart over a 24 square mile area producing up to 454 megawatts (MW) of wind generated energy to be transmitted from a centrally located Electrical Service Platform via a submarine cable to the landfall location in Yarmouth. The overland cable will be installed in existing roadways and right-of-ways to NSTAR's existing electric system in Barnstable. The cable will consist of two solid dielectric cable circuits jet-plow embedded into the seabed. work is shown on the enclosed plans entitled "Cape Wind Project," on 18 sheets, revised "6/1/04." The applicant's intended purpose is to provide wind-generated energy that will be transmitted and distributed to the regional power grid, including Cape Cod and the Islands. They plan to begin construction in November 2005 an begin operating

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

in November 2006.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared by the Corps of Engineers in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act to provide the data needed for the Corps in performing the public interest review described below. The Draft EIS compares alternatives to the benefits; and requests comments on this assessment. This document is available for public inspection at the Corps New England District office by appointment and at the locations listed on the attached Table 1. addition, copies have been provided to federal, state and local agencies. The agencies are specifically to provide comment on areas within their expertise, to provide guidance to the Corps, and include recommendations for permit conditions should a permit be issued. the Draft EIS is being distributed widely on compact disk and be obtained by contacting us at the above address. In order to properly evaluate the proposal, we are seeking public comment. Anyone wishing to comment is encouraged to do so. It is important that we receive your comments on or before January 10,

Please follow these instructions to ensure 1 2 that your comments are received on time and 3 properly recorded: 4 Reference file no. NAE-2004-338-1 5 6 7 Address written comments to: Karen Kirk Adams 8 9 Cape Wind Energy Project EIS Project Manager 10 Corps of Engineers, New England District 11 696 Virginia Road 12 Concord, MA 01742-2751 13 or email: wind.energy@usace.army.mil Mail your comments so that they will be 14 15 received in Concord, MA on or before January 10, 16 2005 17 In addition to, or in lieu of, sending 18 19 written comments, you are invited to attend one of 20 our public hearings. The public hearings dates 21 and locations are: 22 23 Monday -- December 6, 2004 24 Martha's Vineyard Regional High School

ĺ	29
1	Edgartown Road
2	Oak Bluffs, MA 02557
3	
4	Tuesday December 7, 2004
5	Mattacheese Middle School
6	400 Higgins-Crowell Road
7	West Yarmouth, MA 02673-2512
8	
9	Wednesday December 8, 2004
10	Nantucket Community School
11	10 Surfside Road
12	Mary P. Walker Auditorium
13	Nantucket, MA 02554
14	
15	Thursday December 16, 2004
16	Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)
17	77 Massachusetts Avenue, Room 10-250
18	Cambridge, MA 02139-4307
19	
20	All interested federal, state and local
21	agencies, interested private and public
22	organizations, and individuals are invited to
23	attend. Persons wishing to provide oral comments
24	are asked to register prior to the start of the

hearing. Transcripts of the meetings will be prepared. The hearing procedures are available on our web site at

http://www.nae.usace.army.mil/projects/ma/ccwf/hpr ocedures.pdf. After these comments are reviewed, significant new issues are investigated, and modifications are made, a Final EIS will be published and distributed. The final EIS will contain the Corps responses to comments received on the Draft EIS.

The applicant's proposal will have an adverse on 0.68 acres of Essential Fish Habitat (EFH). The District Engineer has made a preliminary determination that site-specific impacts may be substantial. Accordingly, the Corps of Engineers has included an expanded EFH assessment in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, which is being submitted to the National Marine Fisheries Service, who in turn will provide conservation recommendations. The EFH consultation will be concluded prior to the final decision.

The applicant's proposed location is on the USGS Dennis quadrangle sheet at the UTM

coordinates 4610281N and 395983E.

The document was also prepared to satisfy the requirements of the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) and the Cape Cod Commission. Cape Wind Associates, LLC intends to file the DEIR/DRI with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act office for the November 15, 2004 submittal date and it will be posted in the Environmental Monitor on November 23, 2004 to fulfil the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs' (EOEA) MEPA requirement. Publication of the Environmental Monitor will provide information on the comment period duration for the DEIR/DRI.

/s/

Christine A. Godfrey,

17 Chief

18 Regulatory Division

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

A transcript of this hearing is being

24 made to assure a detailed review of all of the

comments. A copy of the transcript will be available at our Concord, Massachusetts headquarters for your review, on our Web site for your use, or you may make arrangements with the stenographer for a copy at your expense.

Individuals speaking this evening will be called to one of the microphones -- that's right, either one of the microphones that's open -- in the order that they signed in and as provided for in the protocol. The protocol, once again, has been distributed in the reception area. When making a statement, please come forward to one of the open mics, state your name and any interest you represent.

Now, as I said, as there are many who wish to provide comment, you will be provided two minutes to speak, no more. Now, I ask you to please abide by the two minute rule, as any additional time that you use will deny others the opportunity to provide their concerns on the record this evening. So, please, let's stick with the two minutes.

Should we run out of time this evening, we will close this hearing and provide all who

signed up but not called to the microphone their opportunity to put their thoughts on the record an additional opportunity at a future time and place, which will be determined later. In other words, we will recess and reconvene just for those individuals signed up and not called.

Should that happen, each one of those individuals will be contacted individually by mail.

Now, the traffic signal that will indicate the following, besides the traffic jam at Innman Square-

(Laughter.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: --the green light will indicate that two minutes are remaining and that's all you have. The amber light will come on when there is one minute left. And the red light, of course, says your time has expired.

Please identify if you're speaking or representing the position of an organization or if you are speaking for an individual. If you're speaking for yourself, just say so.

Now, I want to emphasize that this is the fourth of four hearings that we scheduled in

order to provide everybody the opportunity to be heard. Now, as I have said, there is many who have signed up. Now, I encourage those who are here this evening that have spoken at other hearings to give others the opportunity to be heard. And, again, two minutes.

Once again, we have that additional stenographer located outside the hearing room. Should you wish to dictate an individual statement for the record. Once again, there is no time limits on those statements. Speak as long as you want. We will now begin to receive your comments.

First speaker, Senator Robert O'Leary,
State Senator. He'll be followed by Matthew
Patrick, State Representative.

SEN. ROBERT O'LEARY: Thank you very much. My name is Robert O'Leary, and I represent the Elizabeth Islands, Martha's Vineyard, Nantucket, and Cape Cod.

In addition, I'm Chairman of the Energy Committee in the Senate, and I am opposed to this project, and I have submitted some detailed testimony outlining my concerns.

And on balance, I'm persuaded that the

negatives of this project outweigh the benefits, and I would like to use my time tonight to really to raise two issues.

One is with respect to those who have raised the issue of NIMBYism, who have said those of us who are opposed to this project are driven simply by Not In My Back Yard syndrome. And in it's most scurrilous form, we are reduced to rich waterfront homeowners selfishly trying to protect our ocean views.

I can assure you, we are not all rich.

We don't all own waterfront property. There are

250,000 people whom, many of whom I represent, who

live around Nantucket Sound. And we live there

and we settle there not because of the weather,

not because of the climate, I can assure you of

that, but because it's a special place where the

shore meets the sea, where, according to Henry

David Thoreau, "A man can put his back to America

and look out at the sea."

We are also told that our criticisms are too broad and do not directly relate to the Army Corps EIS. This is a fairly frequent criticism.

My response to that is that the EIS does not

1 respond to our concerns. It considers, as many 2 regulators do, only what it can count. And our 3 objections do not reduce themselves to arithmetic. 4 Over my lifetime, much of Cape Cod has been developed. Much of my adult life, public 5 6 life, has been devoted to try to manage that 7 growth and development. Much of the Cape has been ruined, but much of it still retains those special 8 9 qualities that have drawn millions of people to it 10 for generations. 11 Building 130 windmills--12 FROM THE FLOOR: Time. 13 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. 14 Please submit your entire record so we--15 (Applause.) 16 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker 17 is State Representative Matthew Patrick, who will 18 be followed by State Representative Doug Petersen. Sir? 19 20 REP. MATTHEW PATRICK: I'm 21 Representative Matthew Patrick. I represent the 22 third Barnstable District on Cape Cod. 23 Very rarely in life do we have an 24 opportunity to do something that will improve the

lives of millions of people. The wind farm presents us with this once and a lifetime opportunity. We cannot afford to miss it.

I was the executive director of the Cape and Islands Self-Reliance Corporation, a non-profit energy organization on Cape Cod for fifteen years. During that time, we conducted the creation of the Barnstable County energy management plan.

More than 100 people of all walks of life and pulled political persuasions participated in that effort. One of the top ten recommendations was the encouragement of all renewable energy products, projects, especially wind turbines. It was near a unanimous choice, and it is now a part of the energy element of Cape Cod Commission's Regional Policy Plan.

The Waquoit Bay National and Research Reserve cites a local concern that will be mitigated by the reduction in airborne pollution. They estimate that up to 38 percent of the polluting nutrients in our basin estuaries comes from burning fossil fuels in the form of atmospheric deposition. The wind farm will

provide many permanent high-tech jobs, both on Cape and in Southeastern New England, jobs we desperately need.

According to the U.S. census data, 60 percent of the Cape's current workforce is employed in the service and retail trade sectors, where the average wage is \$20,000 a year without benefits. Soon, there will be a world-wide demand for wind technicians because wind driven electricity is the fastest growing form of electrical generation in the world.

Shell and BP Oil Companies have predicted that 30 percent of the world's electricity will come from wind turbines by the year 2030. I cite these companies because they were the only companies who accurately predict the world supply and average price for oil since the 1970s. Wind and renewable energy generation produced five jobs for every one created by the conventional generation industry, according to the World Watch Institute.

In anticipation of those job opportunities, the Cape Cod's local colleges and-- FROM THE FLOOR: Time--

ĺ	39
1	REP. MATTHEW PATRICK:vocational high
2	schools are developing renewable energy
3	curriculum-
4	FROM THE FLOOR: Time
5	REP. MATTHEW PATRICK:that will train
6	our children.
7	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.
8	(Applause.)
9	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Ladies and
10	Gentleman, and thank you.
11	(Laughter.)
12	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker
13	is State Representative Doug Petersen. He will be
14	followed by State Representative Paul Loscocco.
15	Sir?
16	REP. DOUG PETERSEN: Thank you very
17	much.
18	I'm Representative Doug Petersen. I
19	represent the citizens and non-citizens of
20	Marblehead, Swampscott, and two precincts in Lynn.
21	I've been Christmas shopping, as I'm
22	sure you have, and it seems to me that man's love
23	affair with machines continues unabated. Given
24	that the case and given what I think is probably

the future of man's love affair with machines, we are going to need electricity to power those machines in the absence of a viable alternative.

All right. To produce electricity, we are going to need to have power sources to produce it and that requires building power plants into the foreseeable future, which quite frankly, you are going to block somebody's view or disturb somebody's view. Or, the only other alternative if we are worried about someone's view is to put it in some pristine environment and disturb that pristine environment.

Therefore, it seems to me that this particular project is in line with any other decision making process, in terms of producing a power plant in the future. And here, I think the decision we have is, what is the value of an unblemished horizon line? Are we going to derail at the sun every time a tanker comes across that horizon line and blemishes that? Are we going to rail at the sun when the fog somehow interrupts that horizon line?

I don't feel there is a value to an unblemished horizon line. There is not a pristine

environment in the ocean. We have sunken ships and all sorts of dead carcasses lying in the ocean. It is not a pristine environment and; therefore, we have an opportunity, a historic opportunity to produce a renewable energy source that will be non-polluting and reduce some of the energy we need for our machines into the future.

I think we have an opportunity here, and I hope you see that way, too, and I hope you take advantage of it.

Thank you very much.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

Our next speakers, our next speaker is State Representative Paul Loscocco followed by Mr. Lee Mondale, who will be representing Representative James Eldridge. Sir?

REP. PAUL LOSCOCCO: Thank you to the Committee.

Again, my name is Paul Loscocco. I'm a State Representative for the 8th Middlesex District, representing the 40,000 people of Holliston, Hopkinton, Medway, Southborough, and Westborough, Massachusetts.

I'm the ranking Republican member of the

Legislative Committee as natural resources in agriculture, commerce and labor, and transportation.

We, in the Massachusetts Legislature, have an independent responsibility to the public to formulate a clear public policy on oceans' development.

I know I speak for many of my colleagues in the Massachusetts House of Representative and State Senators, Senate who could not be here tonight, who are gravely concerned about many aspects of the Cape Wind project and its detrimental impact on perhaps the greatest natural resource of the Commonwealth.

Governor Romney and Attorney General Riley have shown great leadership in this issue, including the development of an oceans' management task force to begin to address how, why, and when we are going to develop off shore.

The task force wisely recommended a comprehensive series of licensing provisions, economic considerations, and visual environmental standards for development off the coast. Both the state and federal governments have a

responsibility and legitimate overlapping roles to play in deciding on appropriate levels of compensation to the tax payers for giving up natural resources.

This determination must take place before proposals such as Cape Wind are permitted to go forward. And the State, working in tandem with the federal government must play an integral role in controlling the destiny of a major state resource and the basis of significant part of the Massachusetts economy, tourism.

Presently, under the existing framework, there is not a sufficient state role in the review process, even though the Cape Wind proposal is located in federal waters, this project will have an enormous impact and unique to the citizens of Massachusetts.

What you do or do not do as part of your review for this particular project could also set precedent and have significant adverse affects on the rights of other states to protect their major resources unique to them off their coast.

I respectfully suggest that the Corps, in respective of the rights of the States under

our federal system of government should show deference to the legitimate interests of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as expressed by the Governor and the Attorney General and others and should afford the legislature the opportunity to be integrally evolved in the management and control off our own coastline.

Such deference to the citizens of our state and those who were elected to represent them is fully consistent with your statutory charge, respects the role of the states--

FROM THE FLOOR: Time--

REP. PAUL LOSCOCCO: --and thank you very much.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

Next speaker, Mr. -- next speaker,

Ms. Lee Mondale, speaking for Representative James

Eldridge, who will be followed by Fred Schlicner

speaking for Massachusetts State Rep. Paul Donato.

Ma'am.

LEE MONDALE: Thank you.

Today, Representative James Eldridge wishes to express his support for the proposed wind energy project being proposed in Nantucket

Sound. I support the Cape Wind project for three primary reasons.

First of all, as someone who is a strong environmentalist, I am concerned about how our country's over reliance on using fossil fuels to provide energy to its citizens is destroying the quality of air we breathe, water we drink, and the protection from the sun we receive from the ozone layer around the earth.

Second, I believe that in order to maintain a high standard of living that people in Massachusetts enjoy, including enjoying the use of the national treasure of Cape Cod, our State needs to find supporting alternative -- needs to support finding alternative sources of energy to provide the necessary power to protect and preserve that quality of life.

Finally, as a legislator who represents a district that borders the City of Fitchburg, where another wind energy project is being proposed on land, I am disturbed at the notion that the location of a wind farm in the ocean more than four miles from residence is an adequate reason to stop an energy generating project.

If this project cannot be built given its isolation from people and other living species, how can I in good conscious support any other energy project, wind or non-wind which may have an alleged negative impact on the community that it might be located in.

He -- we are going to run out of time.

So, he has read, he has taken the time to read the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and he has received feedback from his constituents on the project and he has been convinced from conversations with people on both sides and from the information that he has read and the people he has spoken with that this project is one that is good for the Cape and good for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and he thanks you very much.

(Applause.)

LEE MONDALE:

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am. Please put your statement in the box.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,
Mr. Fred Schlicner speaking for Massachusetts

Okay.

Representative Paul Donato and will be followed by

John Crisley speaking for State Representative Patricia Jehlen. Sir?

FRED SCHLICNER: Thank you.

My name is Fred Schlicner, and I am speaking for Paul Donato and making a statement for him. He is a State Representative,

Massachusetts State Representative of the 35th

Middlesex District, which covers residents in

Medford and Malden.

He supports the project. I strongly urge the Army Corps of Engineers to expeditiously complete this review process and issue a permit for the project.

I support the Cape Wind project for the following reasons:

One, the project has been subjected, in my opinion, to a more intense environmental scrutiny and study than any other energy generating facility in Massachusetts's history.

The Corps analysis in the DEIS indicates that negative impacts on aquatic life, on birds, on boat traffic, other environmental concerns will be small and vastly outweighed by the benefits from the reduced emissions of air pollutants and

carbon dioxide.

Two, this project can significantly cut our State's contribution to climate change and curb our risky and expensive dependence on fossil fuels.

Three, this project will be the largest single source of non-polluting renewable energy in New England. Electricity from wind towers, the cleanest tower generation there is, and this project's power will go a long way to help Massachusetts meet its mandated renewable energy portfolio goals for the future.

I comment the Army Corps of Engineers on a thorough and comprehensive effort in developing the Cape Wind Draft EIS. I urge them to expeditiously complete this important review process and issue a permit for the project as soon as is practicable.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker,

John Crisley, who will be speaking for State

Representative Patricia Jehlen; who will be

followed by Mr. James Liedell, from the Town of Yarmouth. Sir.

JOHN CRISLEY: Thank you.

My name is John Crisley. I'm reading this letter for, in support of the project from Representative Patricia Jehlen, the 27th Middlesex District in Somerville.

I write this letter in support of Cape Wind project. There is several reasons why Cape Wind is important to the future of Massachusetts, including my legislative district in Somerville.

First, by expanding the supply of renewable non-fossil fuel electricity generation, Cape Wind would reduce air pollution, including sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, and particulates. This is particularly important in Somerville where we suffer from poor air quality and turn the health impacts on our residents of fossil fueled plants, including Cancer, Asthma, and other lung diseases would be reduced.

Second, Somerville is a member of the International Association, Cities for Climate Protection. As such, we are committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions from our community and in

2003, we released a climate action plan for accomplishing that goal, but the power of a city government to affect emissions is limited, particularly from generating plants whose output we consume, but whose operations are outside our jurisdiction.

Somerville is looking for ways to increase the use of nonpolluting electricity in the community but, at present, the sources of such power are very limited and expensive.

Cape Wind would vastly increase the supply of wind power available in Massachusetts and would presumably have an impact on lowering its cost per unit of electricity.

Third, Cape Wind would be a significant step towards diversifying our sources of power and relying on a source whose cost will remain stable over time. In contrast, fossil fuel plants are subject to the fluctuating global market for oil, natural gas, and coal.

Over the coming years, we can expect the cost of fossil fuels to rise, but there is great uncertainty as to how much. Wind power will not be subject to such uncertainty and will allow

individuals, businesses, and government agencies to purchase power at fixed long term prices.

This being the case, I wholeheartedly state my support for Cape Wind and hope that this will be the only, the first of many wind projects in Massachusetts and throughout New England.

I urge the Corps of Engineers to expeditiously complete its final Environmental Impact Statement and to endorse the project.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Ladies and gentleman, when you are speaking, please ensure that you have the written statement entered into the box here so that we can enter the full statement.

The next speaker will be James Liedell from the Town of Yarmouth, followed by Mark

Breslow, who will be speaking for Susan Falcoff from City Council of Watertown.

Sir.

JAMES LIEDELL: My name is James
Liedell. My first comments tonight are as
Secretary of the Town of Yarmouth Energy Committee

appointed by the Selectman.

Having thoroughly reviewed the DEIS executive summary and many pages of the full report, I commend the Corps and their participating agencies for having produced a very readable, impartial, technically competent, and thus important and complete record of data and conclusions.

We Massachusetts residents are grateful for the dedication to excellence in ferreting out, presenting of truth by the Corps and your sixteen agencies.

Further, I'd like to announce that the Energy Committee of the Town of Yarmouth, as a majority, have voted in favor of the Wind,
Nantucket Sound wind farm.

Secondly, I encourage you to summarize all of your quantitative evaluations into a single totaled net annual dollar amount. This would aid in public understanding of the enormous total project economic benefits which the project will deliver to Cape Cod, Massachusetts, and New England residents.

User electricity price savings, health

savings, balance of payment statement savings, most importantly, the saving of lives, new high paying, year round, leading edge jobs, payments to towns, and other economic benefits.

Quantifiable disadvantages could also then be deducted form those benefits to arrive at a new annual dollar figures. Individuals, also, then could use this figure to determine their own economic and related benefits.

I understand that some drawbacks, such as some consider visual effects of this project or benefits are not readily quantifiable in this way, but since added electricity is needed in this region by 2007, the choice is not between a wind farm, a no-alteration of the land or a seascape. It is between wind turbines--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. FROM THE FLOOR: Time.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you.

Next speaker, Mark Breslow, speaking for Susan Falcoff, City Council of Watertown, who will be followed by George Bryant, Barnstable County.

MARK BRESLOW: I'm speaking for Susan Falcoff, who is a councilor at large for the Town

of Watertown.

I write as an elected member of
Watertown's Town Council. I ran for office in the
belief that all politics are local. I was elected
as an environmental advocate, and I have been
proud to carry this mission forward.

Watertown is a member of Cities for
Climate Protection. We are a community with a
Climate Protection plan and are working hard to
reduce emissions locally, but I am well aware that
regional, national, and international problems
that impact us cannot be solved by local
initiative alone. If the Northeast as a whole
reduces its dependence on fossil fuels, we all
gain.

Two years ago, I had the opportunity to drive from San Francisco to Yosemite National Park, and I was thrilled to see the vast wind farms in the California desert. This trip was planned just for the purpose of appreciating Californian's unique natural environment. I had not known beforehand of the wind farms, but when I saw them, I was impressed not offended.

First, the towers are not, in

themselves, ugly. And second, they represent a forward thinking positive step toward making the world better. In my opinion, the construction of a similar farm in Nantucket Sound will only reflect credit on a vision and environmental concern of Massachusetts residents.

This is especially so given that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement shows that the impacts of Cape Wind on sea life and on water and air quality would be negligible and on birds would be within tolerable limits.

Meanwhile, the project would provide great benefits to the state in terms of improving our air quality, reducing our greenhouse gas emissions, and controlling the future cost and security of electricity.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker. The next speaker, George Bryant, elected official from Barnstable County who will followed by Mark Weissman, Massachusetts State Marine Fisheries.

GEORGE BRYANT: Thank you very much

Colonel Koning and the other people who are here.

I am speaking for myself. I am a member of the Barnstable County Assembly of Delegates, that's a unique elected legislature in Barnstable County. We have discussed this on a number of occasions.

I would like to give you a little background. I've been, I'm a native of Provincetown. I grew up there. I've been involved in politics and on various boards for many years, and I have some photographs, historical photographs which I will caption and give them to you after I speak.

These are proof that wind has been the only source of energy on the Cape until about 100 years ago. The Cape had no water power, it had no rivers to speak of, and we were totally dependent on wind.

And when I was a selectman, about in the late '70s, Commonwealth Electric and Gas put up a test tower in Provincetown and they made a wind rows and gathered information for an entire year. And at the end of that, they came to a conclusion that Provincetown, at least, was the windiest

place on the East Coast. And if you were ever 1 2 there in the winter time, you will know about it. 3 I have great faith in this project. 4 hope they make an awful lot of money, and I hope--5 (Laughter.) --and I hope more of GEORGE BRYANT: 6 7 them are built. We need this. It has a spiritual value more so than an economic value. 8 9 (Applause.) 10 GEORGE BRYANT: I felt so good when I first heard about this. I couldn't believe it. 11 Ι 12 said, "It will be deep sixed at some point along 13 the line," and of course, that's always a 14 possibility, but we are all for it. 15 My family came to the Cape as fisherman, from Cape Britain Island in Nova Scotia about 120 16 or 30 years ago, and that's how they got there, by 17 sail. They didn't all make it back to port, but 18 19 sail and wind and it's our way of doing things, 20 and we are going to have to get back to it. 21 Thank you. 22 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. 23 (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker--

24

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker,
Mr. Mark Weissman, Massachusetts State Marine
Fisheries, who will be followed by Lieutenant
Colonel Will Tyminski, Massachusetts National
Guard. Sir.

MARK WEISSMAN: Good evening. My name is Mark Weissman. I'm a member of the Massachusetts Marine Fisheries Commission, a Cape resident, and a graduate of MIT. I took many courses in this room.

I want to point out some material deficiencies in the DEIS that undermine the credibility of its conclusions regarding sea floor impacts.

Executive Summary Page 14 says, "Due to the predominance of sand in the project area, turbidity associated with construction is anticipated to be relatively low and confined to the area immediately surrounding tower foundations and cable trenches."

The statement that turbidity will be relatively low and confined needs to be quantified. In Boston Harbor, the immediate area

of turbidity plumes from construction projects has been measured as hundreds of feet.

The generalization about the predominance of sand is too broad. An impact analysis should not pick and choose the data on which should make the best case. Appendix 5.1.A shows ten Corps samples and in all ten the upper layers contained silt, silty sand or clay. The likely and cumulative impacts of disturbing these various common sediments should be calculated. There is such a thing as a the death of a thousand cuts.

Scour analysis, Appendix 4.0, has a number of material deficiencies. The smallest diameter particle in the analysis is many times the diameter of fine sand and silt particles present on the site. The strongest current used is 2 feet per second, but elsewhere it says, "currents frequently exceed three knots", which is 3.4 feet per second.

Fin fish resources, Section 5432 take the disingenuous approach of relying on trawl surveys, which is says are of limited use. As a result, Nantucket Sound, apparently does not have

stripe bass or blue fish and herring are rarely caught, despite the fact there are 45 active herring runs from Falmouth to Chatham. You'd be better off using weir catch data.

Commercial fisheries, Section 5433, doesn't realize the fish caught in the sound, many fish are landed elsewhere. Much of the squid catch, for instance, goes to Rhode Island. Throughout catch is mistakenly equated with abundance.

 $\label{eq:MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.} \\$ Thank you.

MARK WEISSMAN: Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: The next speaker, Lieutenant Colonel Will Tyminski-

(Applause.)

 $\label{eq:moderator} \mbox{MODERATOR ROSENBERG: } --\mbox{will be followed}$ by Mark Amorello.

IT. COL. WILL TYMINSKI: Good evening.

I am Lieutenant Colonel Will Tyminski of the

Massachusetts National Guard Environmental and

Readiness Center located at the Massachusetts

Military Reservation, which was listed as a land

based alternative in the DEIS. I am also Director

of Safety and Aviation for the Massachusetts Army National Guard.

The Massachusetts National Guard cannot take a position on the proposed Horseshoe Shoals location for the wind farm, but this organization will strongly object (to any proposal to locate this project on the Massachusetts Military Reservation.

Our objectives are contained in the Appendix 3L and were validated by the study's findings. In addition, the study determined that there was not enough wind power at the MMR. The location of this proposed project on the MMR will end its use as a maneuver training area with no other site in New England being available for that purpose.

A windmill farm on the MMR would cause cessation of Army tactical helicopter training and create a hazard for other military flight operations from Otis Air National Guard base. The amount of disruption of the surface ecology that the construction of this project would entail would destroy the natural habitat which protects the upper Cape water supply reserve.

This disruption of military training and 1 2 habitat is in violation of Chapter 47 in the Massachusetts General Laws and the Memorandum of 3 Agreement between the Department of the Army, the National Guard Bureau, and the Commonwealth. 5 The Massachusetts National Guard must 6 7 prepare its soldiers and airmen for the worst and sustain its training lands to do so. Location of 8 9 the project at the Massachusetts Military 10 Reservation in contrary to these responsibilities. 11 Thank you. 12 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. 13 Next speaker, Mark Amorello, who will be 14 followed by Michael Baker. 15 Mr. Amorello may be in another room or 16 may be working his way down here. 17 FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Amorello is right 18 here. 19 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Okay. 20 MARK AMORELLO: Sorry about that. I was 21 trapped in another room at the other end of the world. 22 I'm Mark Amorello. I'm the Chairman of 23

the Massachusetts Marine Fisheries Commission.

24

I'm also a former member of the New England Fisheries Management Council.

I am not opposed to alternate energy sources, but at what expense? It seems to me that we have a very unique environment in the sound and a very unique way of getting power, and I don't know how we marry the two.

The Commission has come out opposed to the project, not so much on the energy merits, but I think more on the environmental possible impacts. We have several fisheries that are prosecuted out there from commercial, recreational, lobstering, squid, charter boat fishing, tourism. It's just a very unique special place in Massachusetts, and I would think that alternate locations or alternate sources should have been part of this impact statement.

It seems to me there is other windy places. We have Otis, several places on the Cape. Someone earlier spoke of the desert, that's probably a good place for them. I don't consider Nantucket Sound a desert, and I don't think it should be treated like one.

I'm also a little concerned that the

Division of Marine Fisheries didn't take a more active role, or wasn't asked to take a more active role, in the analysis. New England Fisheries

Management Council, I think, should be involved in this, and I also wonder where the Atlantic State's Marine Fisheries Commission is.

We've sent letters as the Commission, and as the Chairman to all of those agencies, and have received letters back that they intend to comment through their habitat committees and their own NEPA process, which I'm sure is the same NEPA rules, it's just they seem to approach it a different way.

That's all. I appreciate your time and thank you for allowing me to comment.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker will be Michael Baker, who will be followed by Charles Gilford (sic).

And a word to the overflow rooms, if you are, if you hear your name spoken, please walk up to the Corps of Engineers Representative who will cue me on the walkie-talkies.

1 Thank you. Sir.

MICHAEL BAKER: Good evening. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak. My name is Michael Robert Baker. I'm a member of Local 103 IBEW. I'm also an elected official of the Town of Wilmington; I serve on the School Committee and also the Town's Master Plan Committee.

In the Town of Wilmington, because of irresponsible corporate misbehavior, we have lost use of five of our eleven wells that supply our Town's water. Here we have a newly started corporation that wants to help the environment and not hurt it, we should take immediate and full advantage of this offer of clean renewable non-pollutant energy source.

Childhood asthma rates are up throughout our great nation. This project would have a direct benefit lowering the pollutants that are poisoning our children. Every time we turn on the news, there's a kid coming home in a body bag over in Iraq because we are over there and the main reason is for oil. We could greatly reduce our needs—

(Applause.)

MICHAEL BAKER: --greatly reduce this energy's needs of Middle East oil, and we know all of that money's going. And here, we have a perfect opportunity to show the rest of this nation that wind energy, clean, renewable wind energy is the way to go. And let us not forget, in a very short 25 years, there's going to be no more oil.

Thank you very much.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker, our next speaker, Charles Gifford from the Wood Hole at Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket Steamship Authority, and that will be the last individual at this time speaking from the protocol. Sir.

CHARLES GIFFORD: Good evening. My name is Captain Charles Gifford. I am the Port Captain for the Steamship Authority in Woods Hole and the U.S. Coast Guard Licensed Mariner.

The Woods Hole Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket Steamship Authority wishes to state for the record that it's strongly opposed to the

construction of 130 wind powered turbines and sizeable switching platform covering 24 square miles on Horseshoe Shoal in Nantucket Sound.

As a year round user of the sound, the Steamship Authority provides over 14,000 trips a year transporting three million passengers and up to 600,000 cars and trucks between Cape Cod and the islands of Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard.

It is our opinion that this complex has a potential for creating a significant hazard to the safe navigation for our vessels and the users of the waterways. Despite the fact that our licensed captains, as well as those with competing ferry companies, normally navigate buoy to buoy when established shipping channels.

It seems inevitable that under any one of the combination of adverse circumstances, a complex of this size at some point in time, will contribute to a serious marine accident.

As the proposed towers are placed in an area where both commercial and recreational traffic is, at times, heavy, the smaller vessels will be forced to navigate towards the east and in the area of broken ground, and Bishops and Clerks.

Due to the current in the areas, there is a potential for the towers to change bottom contours, created unchartered shoal areas where larger vessels navigate. While there are obvious numerous scenarios that may be cited, the concluding factor is that the proposed complex offers a significant number of potential hazards that cannot be ignored.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Maritime history is testimony to the fact that accidents at sea happen quickly, often without warning and in locations where they are expected to occur, least expected to occur.

The placement of 131 towers and switching platform tangents to a channel normally used by authority's ferries is a great concern to the safety of our vessels, passengers, and freight. As the record will attest, we have strived for and managed to achieve an excellent record for safety.

We ask our vessels and captains not be challenged by unnecessary obstacles placed in close proximity to our normal navigational track to and from our destinations.

FROM THE FLOOR: Time.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Please submit the entire statement for the record.

Our next speaker will be Jane Bright, followed by Barbara Durkin.

JANE BRIGHT: Good evening. My name is Jane Bright, and I live and work in Marblehead.

Last week I was juggling my mother, getting her out of the hospital with Heart Disease problems, just in time to take my husband in for some minor surgery for skin Cancer. I have had Cancer. My son grew up with Asthma. Heart Disease, Cancer, Asthma -- we are a typical Massachusetts family.

We also live under the shadow of the Salem Power Plant and a few years ago got very involved with another group of folks to form the group, Health Link, which was very involved in getting regulations to reduce pollution from the power plant, and we are very proud of those regulations.

But the tonnage of pollution that is going to continue to come out of these old power

plants is very significant. What we are talking about with this proposal for Cape Wind is the difference between our health and visual impact.

I mean, when you really cut through what the issues are, and the DEIS did a very nice job at looking at all of those issues, it's the visual versus human health.

Let me show you the visual alternative.

And this is Diana here. If she will hold this up.

And if you put this, and turn it to the audience please. This is the Salem Power Plant. This is a picture that was taken in the 1970s and it was taken across Beverly Harbor. And as you can see, and the reason I chose this picture, you can see the complexity of air pollution.

And if you'll turn it again to the audience, you can see that the higher stacks go one way, the lower stacks go another way. Air pollution is very complex, it goes everywhere. And what people may not realize on the Cape is that Cape Cod has worse air pollution than Boston. And part of that is because of the recirculation.

The person who owns this poster is actually a meteorologist and public health

official who has done some extensive studies on the Cape. And because of the land mass being warm and the water mass being cold, the circulation happens such the pollution just keeps getting recirculated, regurgitated-

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.

FROM THE FLOOR: Time.

JANE BRIGHT: Opps, sorry. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,

Barbara--

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Barbara Durkin followed by Shaun Breau.

BARBARA DURKIN: My name is Barbara

Durkin. I live in Northborough, Massachusetts,

and I'm speaking for myself. Northborough is

centrally located in this State.

I oppose the idea of America's first offshore wind farm being placed in Nantucket Sound. My opposition is based on my opinion that this unspoiled area should not be squandered and disfigured. This sanctuary should be protected by statutes and under the jurisdiction of the

Commonwealth standing in the shoes of the federal government.

I read about and listened to the proponents of Cape Wind argue that the opposition consists of elitists who do not want wind towers in their backyard. I am a lifelong tourist of the Cape and the Islands. The so-called weekend warrior.

I know enough about boating and sailing to be of concern to the Coast Guard.

(Laughter.)

BARBARA DURKIN: I have navigated from the Cape to the Islands in small craft and under sail or power on many occasions. I have developed abundant respect for the weather and changing conditions in Nantucket Sound and only by God's hand am I here now speaking.

(Laughter.)

BARBARA DURKIN: I cannot fathom tacking a sailboat through 130 wind towers. Even your seasoned boat pilots have stated that wind towers are a bad idea in Nantucket Sound. I go to the Cape and the Island to get away from the City blight.

The idea of wind towers in this area is like a Cancer spread from the city to the unspoiled sound. I would prefer to remember the areas as I have always known them to be. If wind towers arrive like a Cancer, I will be reluctant to return as a tourist.

We need alternative energy, and I'm open to the idea of wind towers elsewhere--

(Laughter.)

BARBARA DURKIN: --such as in my backyard in central Massachusetts. I would rather wake up to them daily than to see them scar the beautiful Cape and the Islands, especially Nantucket Sound.

In the interest of full disclosure to any entity present who may consider my land based solution, unlike federal waters, there is no alleged hole in my land management policy that will provide for free use of my property. If you are to enter into negotiations with me for this land based wind farm, you will be required to pay your fair share of rent.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am. Thank you, ma'am.

(Applause.)

 $\label{eq:MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker,} % \end{substitute} % \end{substitute}$

SHAUN BREAU: My name is Shaun Breau. I have been a resident, a grateful resident of Cape Cod for over 35 years, and my family has been going there for over 70 years.

I'm opposed to the project being located in Nantucket Sound. If they want to locate it a point of usage or something, I think it would be a great thing, but just not in Nantucket Sound. There is just too many environmental unanswered questions about it.

I work all over the Cape and I see all sorts of environmental problems with normal things that happen in the various towns. I just see this as being a giant nightmare. And I can remember an adage my late father told me one time, "If it sounds too good to be true, it is," and I think this is that.

I think it's too good to be true. Thanks.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: The next speaker, Jules Clark, will be followed by Erik Gehring.

JULES CLARK: Good evening. My name is Jules Clark. I'm a resident of Hyannis, and I proudly work for Save our Sound. I am also the founder of a national organization. It's called, Cape Cod Supporting our Soldiers and Wounded.

I am here tonight to call on Cape Wind and its supporters to stop its despicable practice of using our soldiers as a selling point for their wind factory.

Recently, there was an Amendment introduced by Senator John Warner of Virginia that called for federal guidelines to manage our offshore developments.

In response to this Amendment Cape Wind put out an e-mail blast that begins as follows:

"At a time when Americans are more concerned than ever about our dependence on Mid-East oil, with our soldiers dying in Iraq, and with record high oil prices, Senator Warner is attempting to block one of America's options for reducing our dependence on the Middle East developing clean offshore American wind power."

When I read Cape Wind's e-mail, I felt as though I had been kicked in the stomach and I still do tonight.

FROM THE FLOOR: Oh, no.

JULES CLARK: Because on August 8th of this year, my beautiful 19 year old cousin, Lance Corporal Jonathan Collins a Marine, was killed in Al Anbar, Iraq. He was a brother, a son, a jokester, an avid soccer player, an actor, and he had a thousand watt smile and an infectious laugh. In his short life, he touched so many people.

It is absolutely, positively, unequivocally unconscionable that Cape Wind is using the War in Iraq as support for its for profit venture. No more will their proposed wind plant cut down the number of our soldiers dying in Iraq that will wean us from our dependency from foreign oil.

Cape Wind should not use my cousin nor any of the other brave young men and women in Iraq as some kind of selling point for its project.

Jonathan died defending each and every one of us in this room tonight. He did not die to line the pockets of the likes of Jim Gordon and his Cape

Wind Associates.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker is Erik G-E-H-R-I-N-G. He will be followed by Larry Christian (sic) and ladies and gentlemen, I ask that we continue to follow just one simple rule this evening, be polite, please do not interrupt any of the speakers, whether or not they represent your point of view or not.

I certainly believe that everybody here has the right to express their opinions. So, please, let's be orderly and let's not allow individuals to speak with the fear of they may be belittled for their views, and I thank you for that.

Erik.

ERIK GEHRING: Hi. My name is Erik

Gehring. I represent the Boston Climate Action

Network. We are a citizen's group that works

through education and advocacy to make Boston a

leader in Climate Protection, cleaner air, and
energy independence.

I'm wearing green today to show BCAN

support for the Cape Wind proposal. The Army
Corps Draft EIS clearly shows the project will be
a boon for the Commonwealth, both economically and
environmentally. What's good for Massachusetts is
good for Boston.

There remains little doubt that greenhouse gas emissions are rapidly changing our climate and increasing the severity of weather. For example, Boston's top ten snowstorms have all occurred since 1958, in the last 46 years. Even though records have been kept since 1892, for 112 years, topping the list at 27 ½ inches in the President's Day storm of 2003, which also sets snowfall records up and down the East Coast.

These storms exact a tremendous toll in terms of clean-up, real estate damage, and lost productivity. If we fail to act now, the consequences will be all the more severe for our children and our children's children.

The Army Corps addresses such future costs all too briefly in the Draft EIS. We would like to see more analysis of how such extreme weather will effect Cape Cod, Massachusetts and how a mid range estimate of an 18 inch rise in sea

level by century's end will effect our coast line.

Cape Wind won't prevent climate change by itself, but it will offset nearly one million tons of carbon dioxide, making this the single most beneficial action we can take to promote energy independence, clear our air, and reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

This project will prove to communities across the state and the nation, Boston included, that climate stability and inexpensive, reliable energy are not mutually exclusive entities.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak and thank you for having this hearing here today.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

Next speaker, Larry C-H-R-E-T-I-E-N, followed by

Glenn Barnes. Sir?

LARRY CRETIEN: Thank you.

My name is Larry Cretien. I'm the executive director of the Mass Energy Consumers Alliance. We offer strong but contingent support for Cape Wind to remove any contingency from our support, we asked the Army Corps to work with the Mass. Audubon Society to collect more data on the

potential impacts upon turns, water foul, passerines and sea ducks.

I want to point out that the Mass.

Audubon Society is probably the largest consumer of wind power in New England, and we praise them for that commitment.

The final EIS might want to consider how Massachusetts would be able to achieve the goals of the recently released Climate Protection plan without bringing Cape Wind on line. The burden of proof is on the Romney administration for that aspect.

We note that by 2010, greater Boston will be dependent upon expensive natural gas for 80 to 90 percent of its power supply. Therefore, from the perspective of a rate payer, the Cape Wind project promises significant relief.

Much of the tension around the Cape Wind project is that it is a private development in public waters. Therefore, we challenge Cape Wind, public officials, and the Army Corps to explore ways to have a public private partnership.

The Massachusetts, Massachusetts, Rhode
Island, and Connecticut have a renewable portfolio

standard, and we know the progress is not being made fast enough, and we are not getting the environmental benefits that we need.

Very soon, consumers will be paying about \$60 for RECS that they won't get. Those are Renewable Energy Certificates. The Cape Wind project will provide real energy and real RECS affordably.

My organization will offer further testimony by February 24th, and I want to thank you for offering me this opportunity.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,

Glenn Barnes. He will be followed by Jonathan

Davis.

GLENN BARNES: Good evening. My name is Glenn Barnes. I'm from the Town of Waltham, and I want to thank the Army Corps for having this hearing and especially having a hearing in the Boston area, because I feel this particular issue surrounding Cape Wind is not only a Cape specific issue, but is a state issue and a regional issue.

To that end, the government of

Massachusetts, the Eastern New England states, and the Eastern Canadian provinces have developed a climate action plan that sets targets towards renewable energy goals. In addition,

Massachusetts has a statutory regulation under the renewable portfolio standard to produce a certain amount of renewable electricity as part of the New England power grid.

Now, while a 4,000 page report is certainly impressive, I will be bold to suggest that a few sections need to be added, specifically into the air and climate section, which is 5.15.

What I would like to see in this is more of a discussion of how the New England power grid operates. That, certainly, turning on electricity in the Cape Wind project will reduce pollution somewhere in New England and there are different cells. And for the Army Corps to examine what those impacts could be. In this section, it gives statements that it, you know, it has the potential to reduce pollution, but not specifics.

In, I guess, the lowest reduction would be if it's all natural gas, the highest is if it is all coal. But, certainly, that would be

something that I would want to see considered in 1 2 that section. And the other consideration would be how 3 4 Massachusetts may meet our renewable energy goals 5 without the Cape Wind project, as this is the 6 largest project being proposed at the moment and 7 since no other large scale projects are currently underway and because we are behind in meeting 8 9 those goals. 10 So, those would be my suggestions. 11 Thank you. 12 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. 13 (Applause.) 14 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, 15 Jonathan Davids (sic) followed by Dorte Griswold. FROM THE FLOOR: He's not speaking. 16 17 FROM THE FLOOR: He's not speaking. Mv 18 husband is speaking. 19 FROM THE FLOOR: William wants to speak. 20 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you. 21 JONATHAN DAVIS: Good evening. 22 My name is Jonathan Davis. I live in 23 Newton, Massachusetts. I am here as a private

citizen. I am not associated with any

24

organization.

First of all, I want to thank you very much, the Army Corps of Engineers for a very thorough report, and I want to tell you why I'm here. Because I think that this is probably one of the most important issues that our country has to address today, the issue of development of renewable energy.

I'm not talking specifically about Cape Wind. What I am talking about is, the need for us, finally, to take seriously the question of our dependence upon mostly imported polluting sources of nonrenewable energy.

We need to start taking this issue seriously, and I think that this, and I don't think that there is any question that this is one of the first really viable efforts put forth for an economic alternative to the use of imported oil and natural gas.

And I hope that we have the courage to proceed to the development of this project and other projects like it because both for political, geopolitical and environmental reasons, it is absolutely critical that we address these issues.

Thank you.

2 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, William Griswold, followed by Matthew Palmer.

WILLIAM GRISWOLD: My name is William Griswold. I live in Centerville, and I'm a member of the Clean Power Now organization.

Last January, my wife and I organized a trip to Western Denmark and we took 26 people from Cape Cod to see an offshore wind farm first hand ourselves with our own eyes.

What we found was, when we got there, actually, the first day was overcast so we couldn't see anything. The second day, you can see it on the horizon. The distance out to Horns Rev is about seven miles, but the first thing you think of is, does anybody have a pair of binoculars because, without magnification, you really can't see anything at that location.

Now the Draft Environmental Impact

Report has an estimated bird kill of 364 birds per year or one bird per day. I'm not sure where you got that. I think that's appropriate to a land

based wind farm, but for an offshore wind farm, the appropriate figure is probably one bird per turbine per year, which would make Horseshoe Shoal about 130 in the bird kill and that's about a third of your estimate.

In fact, at Horns Rev in Western

Denmark, they haven't yet recorded a bird kill.

And the reason seems to be, just as a chickadee

can fly through a forest and not crash into trees.

So, ducks can fly through a wind farm and not

crash into the turbine. And on their radars,

they've recorded ducks simply altering course,

flocks of ducks altering course.

The other thing that is interesting at Horns Rev is that the number of ducks has enormously increased, doubled or tripled. It appears that the base matting that is anti-scour at the base of the monipole is an ideal habitat for shellfish. And the Eider duck principally feeds on shellfish. So, Eider ducks have doubled. Another bird, Black Scoter have tripled.

So, rather than having a decline of 364 birds, there may be an increase of several thousand. We have a video about the trip that

I'll put in the record.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker is Matthew Palmer, who will be followed by another Jonathan Davids.

(Laughter.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you.

MATT PALMER: Good evening. My name is Matt Palmer. I'm a resident of West Barnstable and I'm also the Executive Director of Clean Power Now. I would like to thank the Army Corps of Engineers for holding these public hearings and for trying to be as fair and impartial as possible in holding these hearings under what might be some very trying circumstances.

Clean Power Now has studied the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and we will be submitting some detailed substantive written comments to you before the end of the public comment period.

There are a few of us here tonight who came up from the Cape and Islands to represent the thousands of people on the Cape and Islands who

are supporters of the Cape Wind project. We felt it was very important that the voice of the local support be heard here in Boston.

Cape Wind is America's first proposed offshore wind farm. The potential of our offshore wind resource is vast. The technology is viable, robust, and ready. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement clearly indicates that the benefits of this project far outweigh the impacts. When the final determination is made, the project should be allowed to go forward.

If it doesn't go forward for the wrong reasons, this could be a significant set back to the development of renewable energy for our entire country for a very long time.

If this project is allowed to go forward for the right reasons, it could spark our renewable energy revolution. I live on Cape Cod.

I've been living there full time for 15 years.

Both of my children were born on the Cape. As a Cape Codder, I forward to the day when Cape Cod, my home will be the birthplace of America's renewable energy revolution, and I look forward to the day when this wind farm will be there in my

front yard.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker,
Jonathan Davis, Davids, followed by Lis Argo.
Sir.

JONATHAN DAVIDS: My name is Jonathan Davids, and I'm here to testify in support of Cape Wind. I understand that some people do not want their ocean view effected by this, but I would urge them to look at the bigger picture.

This project would be a step towards energy independence and sustainability. We cannot afford to continue relying solely on fossil fuels for our energy in this country.

More and more, people are getting sick breathing in the particulate matter from smokestacks or by being exposed to mercury in the fish. The world scientific community largely agrees that global warming is happening and posses a serious threat to the planet and to us.

The people of Cape Wind have worked tremendously hard developing their plan for the first offshore wind farm in the U.S. It is up to

us all to give them our support. I also call upon the Army Corps of Engineers timely and diligent completion of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Thank you for this hearing, and I hope you consider our comments carefully.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

Next speaker, Liz Argo, followed by Carl
Freeman.

LIZ ARGO: Hi there. I'm Liz Argo. I'm from Orleans, born and raised on Cape Cod. I am also a member of Clean Power Now. I am the producer director of the video Prevailing Winds in Denmark, which is the video which provides the public the opportunity to see an actual wind farm offshore, and I hope people take advantage of it. It is enlightening.

We also have many interviews with the people of Blavand, Denmark all in support. We could not uncover one person who had anything negative to say.

I am here with my children on my sweatshirt because I'm making a plea for their

very health. The statistics that have come out in terms of what can be eliminated in the pollution of our Cape Cod airs, and we do know now, that Cape Cod has a real problem with air pollution, 50 percent dirtier air here -- I'm sorry, I'm in Boston today, aren't I -- on Cape Cod than here, in Boston. So, I'm actually giving my lungs a break by coming to Boston today.

(Laughter.)

Asthma attacks per year and twelve to fifteen premature deaths are not just numbers to my kids, my brothers kids, and in fact, myself. I'm an Asthma sufferer too. We are the Asthma statistics. We very well could be those premature deaths.

Please make sure that the consideration of this wind farm is in the right balance when we are looking at a small view, a view of small little wind turbines sticking up on the horizon. They look like masts; they are very hard to see. It cannot be that my children's health will be less important than that view.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: 1 Thank you, ma'am. 2 (Applause.) MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Carl 3 4 Freeman, followed by Christopher Stimpson. Sir. CARL FREEMAN: My name is Carl Freeman. 5 6 I'm from Cape Cod, Dennis. 7 I wanted to ask the Army Corps to look into the impact of the pollution on the Cape on 8 children's ADD, ADHD, and I would like to sing a 9 10 little song I wrote, I modified. 11 (Sung to Blowing in the wind by Bob 12 Dylan.) 13 How many regulations can the power plants flaunt before they are finally shutdown? 14 15 Yes, and how many particulates must fill our lungs before a clean source can be found? 16 17 Join in if you know it. CARL FREEMAN and AUDIENCE: The answer 18 19 my friend, is blowing in the wind. The answer is 20 blowing in the wind. 21 CARL FREEMAN: How many wars must we 22 fight to secure the oil fields in an other land? 23 Yes, and how many lives will they spread in their 24 crusade before we stop the blood spilled on the

sand?

CARL FREEMAN and AUDIENCE: The answer my friend, is blowing in the wind. The answer is blowing in the wind.

CARL FREEMAN: How many windmills will it take to replace resources that leave the world unstable? Despite what big business would have us believe, pollution is 100 percent preventable.

AUDIENCE: The answer my friend is blowing in the wind. The answer is blowing in the wind.

CARL FREEMAN: I'd like to thank the Army Corps of Engineers for their thorough study of the impact of the wind farm. I would like to thank the opponents of the wind farm for making sure every reasonable question has been asked in improving the quality of the report. Thank you.

I'd like to thank those who've read the report and can see the enormous good it can do for health, energy, cost, environment and foreign dependence. Everyone wants clean energy. No one wants to harm the Nantucket Sound.

At this point, each of us must ask yourselves what kind of people are we; do we latch

onto a menu of half truths or do we heed three 1 2 years of research that shows a wind farm can do so 3 much good for our Commonwealth. 4 Thank you. 5 (Applause.) 6 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you. 7 Thank you very much. I'm sure ASCAP will be 8 contacting you later. 9 (Laughter.) 10 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker 11 is Christopher Stimpson, who will be followed by 12 Jed Thorp. Sir. 13 FROM THE FLOOR: Point of order? Was 14 that presentation really in order? 15 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Yes. 16 FROM THE FLOOR: Thank you, sir. Yes, 17 sir. 18 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you. 19 CHRISTOPHER STIMPSON: My only question 20 is, how do I follow that? 21 (Laughter.) 22 CHRISTOPHER STIMPSON: My name is 23 Christopher Stimpson. I'm from Bourne, 25 year 24 Cape resident and member of Clean Power Now.

The Army Corps of Engineers is charged with determining whether Cape Wind project is in the public interest. From your own Draft Statement, gentleman, significant reduction in pollutants; reduction in Asthma and respiratory disease rates; savings of \$53 million in health care costs; savings of 12 premature deaths a year; addition of 391 jobs; savings of \$25 million a year in electrical charges; buffering energy cost increases resulting from the rise in fossil fuel prices; it won't harm property values; and it may enhance tourism and fishing.

There is a need for the capacity provided by the wind farm. It will mean decreased reliance on imported fuels and it will help satisfy the requirements of the renewable portfolio standard.

Commercial activities around the turbines will not be effected. There will be no adverse impacts to marine mammals or fish. One bird dies a day and minimal seabed disturbance. That's from your own statement, ladies and gentleman.

Now, that sounds like a public interest

to me, and I live on the Cape, and I like that, but wait a minute, Nantucket Sound is a national treasure; isn't it? What does that mean, by the way? Does that mean its on the national register of treasured places? I mean, I don't know. I really don't know what it means. It's not a national park, it's not a national seashore. It's a piece of water.

When I spoke to the Deputy Director of the National Marine Sanctuaries Program, he told me this piece of water has already been turned down twice for National Marine Sanctuary status. It's a piece of water no more special than New Bedford Harbor or Boston Harbor or Long Island Sound.

As the people on the East Coast lines if they think Nantucket Sound is more valuable than their piece of water. But, if it really is, for some reason, more valuable, okay. Let's put the wind farm in one of those other places. Then, that fabulous public benefit that the Army Corps of Engineers has uncovered will accrue not to the people of the Cape and Islands, but to the people in those other places.

We, on the Cape and Islands, will be stuck with our polluting power plants.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

CHRISTOPHER STIMPSON: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker, Jed Thorp, who will be followed by Judy Chang.

JED THORP: I want to thank Carl for getting the crowd warmed up for me.

(Laughter.)

JED THORP: My name is Jed Thorp, and I work for Clean Water Action here in Boston. We have over 25,000 members statewide.

We've worked with a coalition of groups over the past seven years to press for the clean-up of the oldest and dirtiest coal and oil fired power plants in Massachusetts.

We are glad to see that the Army Corps included several pages in the DEIS highlighting the potential health benefits of the Cape Wind project. Right now, there are smokestacks in Somerset, Massachusetts that put out over 35,000 tons of sulphur dioxide and over 10,000 tons of nitrogen oxides into the air every year.

And not only do the residents in Somerset and surrounding communities have to live with their view being obstructed by those smokestacks, they also have to breathe in the pollution that could shorten their life.

There are also smokestacks in Salem,

Massachusetts that dump the same pollution on
nearby residents. And last February, while
speaking in front of that plant in Salem, our
Governor Mit Romney, said the following and I
quote: "If the choice is between dirty power
plants or protecting the health of the people of
Massachusetts, there is no choice in my mind. I
will always come down on the side of public
health."

Since the DEIS shows quite well that the Cape Wind will result in significant health benefits to the people of Massachusetts, I'm confused as to why he has taken this position.

The opposition of this project has used many false arguments and distorted the facts to make their case and they would like you to believe that the choice we have to make is between a wind farm or no wind farm. But that's not the choice

we are making. The choice is whether we want a wind turbine here or a smokestack over there.

And since we know that we will need to increase energy production in the future, and since we do have a choice on where we get that power, how could anyone pick the smokestack over the wind turbine.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker, Judy Chang, will be followed by Seth Kaplan.

JUDY CHANG: Good evening. Thank you for this opportunity to speak of my support for the Cape Wind project.

My name is Judy Chang. I'm a resident of Beverly, a city in the north shore of Boston.

I'm an energy economist and heavily involved in the electricity market here in New England and everywhere around the country.

I'm going to raise two points for everyone to consider. One, our choice for future generation and, two, how to follow the lead of other industrialized countries in this matter.

We must keep in mind, as we deliberate, about the Cape Wind issue that our economic well being depends on the availability of electricity. So, unless we want electricity shortage, we must choose where it comes from.

First and foremost, we must and we need earnest conservation efforts; however, if we do not conserve enough to offset our growing needs, we will need more electricity here in this country, in New England, and here in Massachusetts.

We only have a few choices. We have nuclear, we have coal, natural gas, oil, and some renewable resources, such as wind. I choose wind because it is one of the principal environmental sustainable resource we have.

I care about our national treasure, too, and I'm a sailor who adores the open sea. But, I also believe that building wind power generation in our shores is a sign of progress and demonstrates that we have improved our resource management capabilities.

Other industrialized countries like Denmark and Germany have managed to develop successful wind projects, projects that its citizens are proud of. Twenty percent of Denmark's electric generation come from wind and six percent for Germany. We should learn from their experiences and success. For example, we can follow their lead in having the majority of their wind projects be community owned.

So, instead of attacking each other on the degree of aesthetic issues, when we ultimately agree that wind power is an important future resource, we should combine our efforts to find the most beneficial arrangements to make wind power development happen right here in New England.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.
(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker, Seth Kaplan, who will be followed by Ole Tangen.

And I would like to thank Senator Kerry, he sent Mr. Ty Crowley here tonight to sit through this hearing.

Thank you, sir.

SETH KAPLAN: Thank you very much. My

name is Seth Kaplan. I'm a senior attorney and I direct the Clean Energy and Climate Change Program of the Conservation Law Foundation, a regional member supported environmental organization and join on line at clf.org.

(Laughter.)

SETH KAPLAN: CLF will be submitting written comments regarding all of the issues raised in the Draft Environmental Impact
Statement, including avian issues and marine.

I will focus today on what motivates us, which is the urgent need to protect Nantucket Sound, the oceans, Cape Islands, and the natural environment and the public health.

Specifically, I'm here just to address one particular deficiency in the DEISR. The final document should have a full discussion of the positive benefits of emissions reductions that, both that would directly flow from the operation of the proposed facility, and more importantly, the emissions reductions from other projects that are likely to be built, if this process that we are engaging in today unfolds in a timely, orderly, and thorough manner setting a positive

precedent.

I would direct the court to its own prior precedents regarding cargo shipping and its look at the way that individual projects can help to build a cohesive system nationally. That does provide guidance in terms of the precedental value of projects and that it is appropriate to look at that precedental value in evaluating an individual project.

More largely, the tools that we use to address environmental problems, whether they are sewerage treatment plants that are needed to address problems like the fecal chloroform percolating out of some communities in the Cape or power plants to generate electricity sometimes aren't pretty.

But, there is an urgent need for us to identify the tools that we need to solve our problems. And here, we have an opportunity, in terms of through the wind resource of Nantucket Sound, to embrace one potential tool to generating electricity in a cleaner manner.

Thank you very much.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Ole Tangen, followed by Paul Levy or Levie.

Mr. Tangen?

(No verbal response.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: We will call you again a little later.

Paul Levie?

PAUL LEVIE: Levie.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Mr. Levie will be followed by Laurie Robertson-Lorant.

PAUL LEVIE: Thank you. My name is Paul Levie and I live in Brockton, Massachusetts.

The other day, a couple weeks ago, I was with friends in a restaurant on the east side of the canal. And after coming out, we could look up, and we saw this power plant. The power plan was blowing in the direction of the Cape and what was coming out was going into the lungs of all of the children, in men, women, and children of the Cape.

I'm a retired school principal and I've become increasingly alarmed recently about the number of Asthma cases. When I started in

education in the '60s, we didn't have but one inhaler at our school.

When I retired in 2001, my nurse's office was a wash in inhalers to the point where we had to code them to make sure the child -- God forbid the wrong child got the wrong dose. So, obviously, we are in need of a clean renewable energy source.

We can no longer continue the way we are. It just isn't going to work. The oil supplies definitely are going to run out some day. We all know that. The oil supply in the Middle East with the instability in that area isn't even guaranteed today.

But more than all of that, more than all of that, the earth is sort of a sacred place. We all live here. You can't escape the fact that we all breathe and we are all connected and we all live in a sacred place.

Stewardship of that sacred place, stewardship of a spiritual nature that a man spoke of before is something you don't hear about anymore. But that really is what we are talking about. Hopefully -- I summer on Nantucket and I'm

on that steamship. It's not going to crash into those wind towers.

And if somebody's view is disturbed, I'm sorry. I really am. But the greater good is stewardship of the planet and stewardship of the health of the people in this planet. It's time for that kind of thinking, not business, not oil, not all of those things, but stewardship for the people.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker-(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker, Laurie Robertson-Lorant, followed by Dan Kuhs.

LAURIE ROBERTSON-LORANT: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm Laurie Robertson-Lorant. I teach at UMass Dartmouth. I have taught writing and literature here at MIT. I'm not on the education department down there. I'm also a member of South Coast Clean Power Now and many environmental organizations.

And as a member, as a resident of the

South Coast, where we are trapped between the Mirant Point plant, two of the dirty dozen, Mirant Point and Brayton Point in Fall River, I am really surprised and we are disheartened by the fact that you have not scheduled a public hearing for us.

We are not on the Cape, we are not on the islands, we are not in Cambridge. We were the most heavily impacted region there on Buzzard's Bay by the Bouchard oil spill, and I respectfully request that before February 24th, on behalf of the residents of New Bedford and the region that you schedule a hearing for those of us who want to speak and can't get to all of these other places to speak.

New Bedford is America's number one fishing point and a deep water fishing port.

General Electric in a collaboration with Vestas, in Denmark, has looked at New Bedford as a site to build a wind turbine factory that would bring high paying skilled jobs to our people, including the young people that I teach at UMass Dartmouth.

We are a region that needs jobs and deserves them. I feel that because we are economically disadvantaged and a very high

minority population down there that we get neglected and ignored by the state, by the Commonwealth and by other federal agencies a lot of the time, and I don't want to see the Army Corps of Engineers ignore us or overlook us down there.

We on the South Coast have the potential for a great cultural and economic renaissance, and educational renaissance that is underway right now with the UMass Center for Marine Science and Technology. We can create a center for state of the art environment friendly technology.

And I firmly believe that if you would come to the South Coast and schedule a hearing for people down there, it's a large region that goes really from Wareham over to Providence, that it would be very much appreciated.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.
(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Dan Kuhs, followed by Lindsay Carroll.

DAN KUHS: My name is Dan Kuhs from the business management of Pile Driver's Local 56 in

Boston. I'm presenting this testimony on behalf of the membership of Pile Driver's Local 56 and their families.

After thorough review of the Draft
Environmental Impact Study, we feel that the
strict regulatory process that the project is
currently going through adequately addresses any
and all environmental and siting issues. The
membership of Local 56, many who live on Cape Cod
and the surrounding areas, will play a key role in
the construction of this much needed renewable
energy project.

In addition to providing long term jobs in the construction of Cape Wind, there will be jobs in the manufacture of wind turbine components and permanent full time maintenance jobs.

We realize the importance of a stringent environmental review and we ask that the Cape Wind project not be held to a higher standard than other offshore construction projects that the Army Corps is permitted.

Projects such as the Deer Island Outfall
Diffuser project. The Deer Island Outfall project
was met with a similar protest from a vocal

minority on Cape Cod and has had no adverse environmental impact on the Cape and Islands since going on line, but it has had a significant positive effect on the quality of Massachusetts Bay waters.

Our membership looks forward to the construction of this project, which will have a positive effect on both the environment and economy of the Commonwealth.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

12 (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Lindsay Carroll, who will be followed by Norris McDonald.

LINDSAY CARROLL: Good evening. I appreciate the opportunity to speak here. I was a 20 year resident of Massachusetts and then I heard of another place New Hampshire, and I'm a 15 year resident of New Hampshire.

I'm an engineer. I work for Thermal
Electron. I know of thermion as co-generation.
I'm a mechanical engineer, and I know little about
gears or gear trains. So, how would I, as a

person, say, "Well, what's good and what's bad?"

I'm a sailor and I like view; I like woods; I like wind.

And I say to myself, "Okay, Lindsay, what do you know; what are you trained to know; what have you heard?"

And here is what I know and what I've seen, that 20, 25 years ago, I heard about this place, Seabrook, they needed power; right, and I heard all of these people protesting and protesting. I said, "Well, what's this all about."

So, now I live there and 20 years later, on my electric bill, only a portion of it is for the kilowatts generated. The failed cost of that project, and who knows in the future the failed cost. I'm still paying for it.

I recognize all of the things of pollution. I'm a marine dosun. We study the sea, we study the seabed, we study the Gulf of Maine. And from what I read, and what I see, and what people have told me, those towers will not impact the marine vegetation, dredging does, things you do on the sea floor do.

And now, on aesthetics, I have a few things to say. If you've read history, in 1500, they came, the Basques came from Spain. Their view of an island would be cod fish drying in the sun. Okay?

In 1700, there were windmills and salt ponds generating salt they needed to produce and preserve the wheats they had. In 1850, what did we have, a decadent fleet of New Bedford Whalers sitting around with their sails. That was normal. What is normal?

My last point is this, I lived in a New England Common, and an old townie says, "Hey, you've got to paint your house white. White is beautiful." But you know what? I striped my house and found that New Englanders loved color. So, what is aesthetic, is it towers; it is wind? I say, who knows, it's by your definition. I'm for the project. I love the wind power, it's clean, the technology is proven, and I believe it can be put on line and made to be viable. If they'll invest in it, I'd go for it.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Norris McDonald, who will be followed by Alf Carroll.

NORRIS McDONALD: Colonel Koning, my name is Norris McDonald. I'm founder and president of the African American Environmentalist Association.

I've traveled here from the Washington D.C. Metropolitan area to give our support to the Cape Wind Energy project.

I would also like to say this is a nebulizer. This is what you have to use when this inhaler doesn't work. It keeps you from going to the emergency room. It will save your life. I also bring a little portable windmill with me to dodge flu. But, the bigger point is that I'm concerned about the fact of banana NIMBYism, that is build absolutely nothing anywhere near anything. Not in my back yard.

(Laughter.)

NORRIS McDONALD: We have that in Washington. We can't get an energy bill passed. We can't get a clean air bill passed. In this country we can't put anything anywhere. You

cannot NIMBY anywhere anytime and expect to have electricity everywhere all of the time.

The EIS does not trigger environmental justice. That's because there is no environmental injustice in this project. But there is an environmental justice issue and it's a positive environmental justice effect because it's an emission free project and that's why we support it.

So, I've traveled here today, and I encourage the opponents of this project, please accept your fair share. Minority communities have accepted a disproportionate amount of pollution--

FROM THE FLOOR: Yeah--

(Applause.)

NORRIS McDONALD: --and some visual distraction. I think you should accept it. So, please, let's proceed to a record of decision and please let's have a finding of no significant impact.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker,

Alf Carroll, followed by Carl Borchert.

ALF CARROLL: Good evening and welcome to MIT. My name is Alf Carroll, and that crazy guy you heard from a minute ago, that's my dad.

(Laughter.)

ALF CARROLL: I'm a happily married man.

I've got two really great kids, and I also come

from a long line of engineers, three generations.

Unlike my dad, who is a mechanical engineer and lives near Seabrook, I'm an ocean engineer and I studied here in MIT. In fact, took several classes in this very room.

We train our kids to conserve energy.

That's what we do. That's what we do in our

family, and we also teach them to respect the

environment. However, others have said it better

than I, the demand continues to go up for

electricity.

As a sailor, where I live in Marion,
Massachusetts, I've recently formed a committee
where we are going to look at putting up a wind
turbine in our town to offset some of the costs of
our high school. Now, why did we start thinking
about that. Why is that all happening down the

Cape and South Coast?

Well, it's this fabulous project that we are talking about tonight. That's what has caused us to all become more aware of this. We are in a nexus here right now. This project has really created a nexus not only for the region but for America. For the United States of America to step out and do the right thing and not, you know, be behind the Europeans for a change. And we really need to do this to enable a change in our behavior and how we look at energy.

As I said, professionally, I'm an MIT Alumnus. I've got a degree in ocean engineering and why do I basically support the wind farm? Let me give you a couple of quick reasons. Obviously, it's the environment. I don't need to say anything more about it. That's been well covered tonight and all of the clean energy benefits that come along with it.

The site itself, is very frankly and excellent confluence of many key trade offs. It's got an enormous wind resource there, enough to make an significant dent in the power requirement. It's got a very short distance to the nearest

electricity grid connection, which means efficiency, and in the shallow water that's there really allows for minimal impact and it is very, it makes this project affordable.

And it also, the structures that were designed to be built here--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. Sorry.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: The next speaker, Carl Borchert, followed by Carolyn Bishop.

CARL BORCHERT: My name is Carl K.

Borchert, and I live on Nantucket Island. I have
lived there for 27 years. My father, Carl F.

Borchert, graduated from MIT in 1958 with a degree
in aeronautical engineering. Thank you for
hosting this hearing.

I am speaking as a member of Clean Power Now and as a concerned citizen. The proposed wind park is rated for a maximum power output of 454 megawatts. To give you an example of how much power that is, one megawatt or one million watts can supply about 1,000 average size homes. Therefore, 454 megawatts times 1,000 equals

454,000 homes.

Recently, we had to sustain wind speeds of 35 to 45 miles an hour for four days. The wind park would have generated enough power for the entire region and the excess would have gone to the New England power pool grid because the average electrical demand for the Cape and Islands is 180 megawatts.

During average wind conditions, the plant would supply 75 percent of the electrical needs of the area. During such output, fossil fuel power plants would be backed off resulting in less toxic air and water pollution.

Given the staggering growth of our region, we ought to embrace this wind park as the most benign source of energy to provide for such growth. On Nantucket Island, there could be 9,000 more houses built.

I ask this question: Do we want clean renewable energy for all of this growth or energy from fossil fuels that fowls our environment and contributes to global warming? Wind power has no fuel costs, produces zero emissions, and is inexhaustible.

We don't have to go to unstable regions of the world like the Middle East to get it. We ought to tap into it right now and start a clean energy revolution right here in Massachusetts.

I ask everyone in this auditorium to consider this, 454 million watts of clean renewable power, enough power for 454,000 homes. Consider this project as the first step towards better public health, respect for the environment, energy independence, good jobs, and economic growth.

The time is now for clean power.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Carolyn Bishop followed by Neal Costello.

CAROLYN BISHOP: Hello. My name is Carolyn Bishop. I'm from Belmont, Massachusetts.

I strongly favor the development of alternative energy sources. We must wean ourselves from outrageous dependence on fossil fuels. Conservation is a major part of the solution to this problem as well as the

development of non-polluting alternative energy sources such as solar and wind power.

Many against the Cape Wind are concerned about aesthetics. I'm more concerns about the errors and gaps in the DEIS and the projects potential for damage to wildlife as it is currently designed. Merely stating there's little environmental risk does not make it so. To dismiss the mortality of 364 birds a year is bad enough, but to base this on faulty or inadequate data is short sided.

The project must not be rushed through. More research is needed on bird flight, migratory patterns, heights of species flight, impact of lighting on avian navigation. Imagine these towers in the fog. I'm concerned about the sea floor disruption. 130 acres with anti-scour mats plus cable trenches. Unrealistic assessment of bird collisions as well as bats.

For example, in West Virginia, they failed to study adequately the impact and more than 70 bats per turbine per year are killed there. The impact on sea turtles. They study electro magnetic thermal emissions, but sea

turtles rely on magnetic navigation and they are certainly in the area.

So, basically, I'm concerned about these issues. I hope they can be addressed so wind power can succeed somewhere and somehow.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Neal Costello, followed by Rebecca Harris.

NEAL COSTELLO: My name is Neal
Costello. I'm the general counsel of the
Competitive Power Coalition of New England which
is a trade group that represents the overwhelming
majority of power plants, electric generating
capacity in New England.

We are here to enthusiastically support the Cape Wind project. We do it for a number of reasons. It is absolutely critical to the reliability of New England's power system. There has not been a proposal for a new generating facility in New England in four years, with the exception of Cape Wind.

ISO New England, that controls the power

grid, has already said we will be in a capacity shortage in New England in 2006 and that not only there are no current projects, there are no projects in the foreseeable future. So, it is critical from the perspective of capacity.

It is also critical from the perspective of fuel diversity. New England is already 50 percent dependent upon natural gas. The numbers that I represent they use natural gas, they use coal, they use oil, they use waste energy, and they use nuclear power to power the grid.

And while some in the audience may disagree, I would argue that we need all of those fuel sources. We need it for reliability and we need it for cost effectiveness. Last January, we came perilously close to both blackouts in New England a lack of home heating fuel because we are so dependent upon natural gas.

So, we need renewable power plants. We don't really need capacity, but we absolutely need Cape Wind. It's critical to the reliability of the system. I would also say that the drafters of the Massachusetts Restructuring Act seven years ago came up with the RPS project to encourage

projects like Cape Wind to be developed within New England.

So, as a matter of public policy,

Massachusetts and the legislature has already gone
on record as saying this is the type of project we
want to encourage.

I would like to end with the notice of environmental justice. Jim Hunt and I grew up in Dorchester, not too far away from the power plant on L. Street. Here in Cambridge there are two power plants. MIT has a power plant; there's one in Kendall. So, just from an environmental justice standpoint and an equity standpoint, the Cape should be required to bear its fair share.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

NEAL COSTELLO: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,
Rebecca Harris, who will be followed by Tim Byrne.
And just a reminder that there is an additional
stenographer outside where you can make private
statement without any of the imposed time
restrictions.

Ma'am.

REBECCA HARRIS: Thanks. I'm Rebecca

Harris. I'm an avian ecologist working at Tufts

University School of Veterinary Medicine, and I

coordinate the seabird ecology assessment network,

sea net, which focuses on threats to marine and

coastal birds through citizen science beach

opportunity to briefly respond to the DEIS.

My comments are focused on avian impacts and are entirely my own. I strongly support the development of renewable energy sources, such as wind power and there is growing evidence from other sites that if siting and risk assessment are done thoroughly in advance of construction, impacts to birds and wildlife can be minimized.

surveys for bird mortality, and I appreciate this

However, I believe the DEIS has some inaccuracies and data gaps that need to be addressed before the process can move forward. The preliminary avian risk assessment recommends further study repeatedly, and I agree that the risks to birds from this project are not well enough understood in additional years of year round aerial boat and radar surveys are vital as recommended also by the Mass. Audubon Society.

On the off cited 364 birds per year killed by the project should be presented as a larger range of values because it's really impossible to predict the level of mortality so precisely where there are so many unknowns.

And each species group should be assessed separately because there are many different issues related to seasonal patterns, night versus day, and various different issues.

The number of birds at road or height in the preliminary radar surveys do not take into account potential attraction to lights which is well documented in night migrating song birds.

And even pulsing red lights have been shown to attract and disorient birds.

In addition, more strikes are likelier to occur during inclement weather as birds can be more easily disoriented and unable to see the structures as mentioned in the DEIS.

So, I conclude that one year of radar study is not enough to produce a reliable estimate of bird strikes, particularly song bird strikes given the annual variability and storm frequency and that sort of thing.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.

REBECCA HARRIS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Tim Byrne, followed by Stephen Peckman (sic).

Mr. Byrne?

(No verbal response.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Stephen Peckman.

Mr. Peckman will be followed by Kathy Kleekamp.

Sir.

STEPHEN PECKHAM: My name is Stephen

Peckham. I live on Nantucket. I am a founding

member of the Nantucket is for Wind Power

Organization. I am a member of Clean Power Now.

Never the less, I speak for myself.

I am puzzled by those who say Nantucket Sound is a national treasure on par with the Grand Canyon. I love to sail and boat in these waters, but let's think about this. Commercial fisherman ply and plunder anything that still survives in the passenger and automobile ferries spewing hundreds and thousands of gallons of diesel fuel and oil pumped into the sound everyday. Brayton Point's coal and Canal Electric's oil power plants

spew tens of thousands of poisonous mercury and pollutants in the air we breathe everyday raining down on these same waters.

What's with the Audubon Society and the bats? Bats give me the creeps.

(Laughter.)

STEPHEN PECKHAM: If it isn't the bats it's the birds. Isn't the issue of bird mortality and human mortality directly linked? As a coal miner. If the air is no good to breathe, the birds die, very simple.

Interesting, Governor Romney opposes the project, denigrates the man behind it, yet, by some strange coincidence his biggest contributor happens to be the Egan families of EMC fame who just happen to have homes in Cotuit and on Great Island fronting Nantucket Sound.

Three of the Egan Family sons are on the Board of Directors, the alliance to protect

Nantucket Sound. This view, this group is an alliance all right. It's an alliance to protect their view. Most of us are not as gullible as you think.

There friends tell them, kill the

project any costs. Our Governor supports

renewable energy projects in a poor community, but

not where the wealthy live. Plain and simple

hypocrisy. It is disgusting and repulsive to hear

those opposed to the project questioning the

ability and the authority and integrity of the

Army Corps of Engineers to review, permit, and

oversee this project.

To the politicians and representatives I say, get your heads out of the sandbar, hands out of the pockets of those who don't care about our well being and health interests. No more political interference or intervention or obstruction. No more sleeping with the enemy. This misdirected alliance.

In conclusion, I want -- no I demand to have cleaner air for my family and my children's children to breathe. I demand--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

FROM THE FLOOR: Time.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

Our next speaker, Kathy Kleekamp,

followed by Kate Adams.

KATHERINE KLEEKAMP: My name is

Katherine Kleekamp. I am a founding director of Cape Clean Air and a I'm a member of Clean Power Now.

I'd like to call your attention to Section 5.10.A in the appendix of the DEIS describing the methodology of experts who created the simulations depicting what the wind turbines would look like. It appears that visual impact from land is one of your significant findings.

Just, first of all, I'm a juried artist member of the Cape Cod Art Association and there's a fundamental principle in art and in nature that objects close to the viewer are large, have great detail and are darker in color.

As objects recede, they become smaller, lose detail and become fainter in color. A faint pale blue gray. And the explanation for this is that as objects are further away, the humidity or water molecules in the atmosphere reflect sunlight to make them more obscure.

In Section 5.10.A of the appendix regarding the series of photographs showing the turbines from various locations I quote, "The effects of distance, hazing bluing loss of detail

were not added to these simulations due to clear sky conditions present at the time the photos were taken."

This tells me the turbines in reality, under frequently humid ocean atmosphere would look even more obscure. Regarding night time visibility, "Upon reviewing night" -- I'm quoting from your document, "Upon reviewing night time simulations described above, it was determined while they accurately portray how a night time photo of the proposed project would appear, they did not accurately illustrate what observers actually saw."

I would like to ask that these effect of atmospheric haze conditions be emphasized more prominently in visual depictions in the final EIS.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Kate Adams, followed by Peter A-L-A-D-J-E-M, Aladjem.

KATE PARKER-ADAMS: Good evening. My name is Kate Parker-Adams. I am a doctoral candidate in environmental epidemiology at UMass

Lowell. I am an engineering graduate of MIT.

And I'm here this evening on behalf of Citizen's Awareness Network, a grassroots organization of anti-nuclear chapters and reactor communities throughout New England and New York.

Now, this hearing is intended to discuss the environmental impact statement for Cape Wind. And while there are undeniable impacts of Cape Wind, lots of questions left over and the ever present potential for unintended consequences, we can't look at this impact statement in a vacuum as an isolated project because there are serious lasting environmental impacts, risks and public health consequences for the entire region of not building Cape Wind.

(Applause.)

electricity, but it has to come from somewhere and it has to be made somehow. Somewhere and somehow can mean Cape Wind or it can mean generation methods which much higher environmental impacts and risks attached.

In New England, somewhere and somehow often mean filthy five fossil plans, like Brayton

Point and Canal Station, and increased and 1 2 extended power production from our aging nuclear power facilities. 3 4 So, if Cape Wind has risk in environmental impacts alone, these risks pale in 5 comparison to those that come from nuclear 6 7 facilities at Pilgrim, at Seabrook, and at Vermont These contained spend fuel pools which 8 Yankee. are ready made dirty bombs for terrorist attacks. 9 10 If a plane went into the spent fuel pool

at Pilgrim, I think property value on the Cape would decline significantly.

(Laughter.)

KATE PARKER-ADAMS: Pilgrim has also applied to extend its license for twenty more That twenty more years of toxic releases. years. That's twenty more years of sea life destruction through voracious water intakes.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.

FROM THE FLOOR: Time.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: The next speaker

23 Peter Aladjem?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

FROM THE FLOOR: I think he left.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Okay. Soren

Jensen will be followed by John D-i-M-O-D-I-C-A.

Sir.

SOREN JENSEN: Start the clock. My name is Soren Jensen and I happen to be a native Dane and I grew up on the West Coast of Denmark and lived there for twenty two years where they built the world's largest offshore windmill park.

Already a couple of speakers has already been talking about this windmill park and they were right in a lot of the things they were talking about.

Not only does Denmark have the largest one in the world, they have the second largest one, too, which was installed last year. And the energy program calls for building not only two but five.

And within the next number of years, the energy plan 21 calls for building 50 percent of the energy in Denmark coming from windmills.

Currently, they have 5,000 windmills there and the project calls for 4,000 megawatts to come from offshore windmills.

Now, this is a country with six million

people and I'm really proud of my countrymen that they can establish this. Now, I visited the West Coast earlier this year because I knew my family lives there, and I wanted to see with my own eyes this humongous, big offshore windmill park that they put in just two years ago.

I talked to the local people there and asked them directly, in my mother tongue, my own dialect, so you could really talk to them and ask them, "What do you think?"

They said, "Well, our biggest concern was the visibility," but it showed up that they could only see the windmill park about half of the time because it's fog, dense, bad weather and so forth.

We saw some small toothpicks out in the distance, and we needed to zoom the camera three to one to actually get a picture of them. And this is what we are talking about. We talked about the fish. They said there's no problems with the fish. What about the tourists? You already heard that 30 American from Cape Cod traveled to Denmark just to see.

(Laughter.)

SOREN JENSEN: So, what is the tourism? So, we go on and on and on. The risk from going from the big transformer tank is minimal. They projected or estimated that it was 1 to 13,000 years that something would happen. I just say that it's about time that this beautiful country where I lived for 24 years, do something about the--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. SOREN JENSEN: Okay. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, John DiModica, who will be followed by Carlos Zalduondo.

JOHN DiMODICA: Hi. My name is John DiModica and I'm the program manager for the Massachusetts Division of Capital Asset Management's Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Design program.

Tonight I'm speaking as a concerned citizen of the commonwealth and not a representative for whom I work, but with my job in the Commonwealth, I manage a program that works with state facilities and agencies to ensure that

our buildings and facilities are constructed and renovated with due concern for their environmental and economic sustainability.

This program results in buildings and facilities that are more energy efficient, exhibit lower emissions from the energy production and use utilize environmentally preferable products and have better indoor air and environmental quality for the occupants and users.

This program at DCAM also manages energy efficiency performance contracts that result in significant capital improvements in energy and water using systems and infrastructure at state facilities.

The investments made through this facility are financed solely through the downstream savings that result from the improved energy and water consumption of facilities post retrofit. Such projects typically result in several millions or tens of millions of dollars worth of capital investment funded solely through project savings.

We often have renewable energy resources to these projects for both their energy savings as

well as for their environmental performance and for other reasons, including their match to facilities core purposes.

Among the renewable technologies that have been successfully integrated into state projects are photovoltaic arrays, biomass boilers and fuel cells. We are beginning to invest and get opportunities to develop wind turbines at several facilities and firmly believe that they will be successfully integrated into the mix of projects developed.

The actions undertaken by DCAM's program are consistent with the no regrets policies articulated by Governor Romney in the Massachusetts Climate Protection plan issued earlier this year. My statement in support of Cape Wind here tonight is based on its consistency with this plan and with our state government's policies which match our economic prerogatives with environmentally—

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker, Carlos Zalduondo, who will be followed by Gabriel

Shapiro.

And sir, I've just been given word by the stenographer that he'll need to take a break. If I could suggest that after Mr. Shapiro we take about a fifteen, twenty minute break.

Thank you.

CARLOS ZALDUONDO: Okay. Thank you very much.

My name is Carlos Zalduondo, and I'm speaking in support of the Cape Wind project. As a resident of the Town of Hull, I have first hand experience living in close proximity to a wind turbine. I have heard the arguments of the opposition makes to this project and in my experience, none of their dire predictions have materialized in my town.

Tourism has increased because of the wind turbine in Hull. People from all over the state come to see it in action. I take all of my guests to see it and not one of them has complained about it being too loud or too ugly.

On the contrary, most of them are amazed at how quiet it is and wonder why some people claim they are loud and disturbing. They also

wonder what is so offensive about their appearance.

Opponents of Cape Wind, like Governor

Romney, made the argument that they are ugly

things better kept out of view. Sure, out of view

from wealthy folks that are immune to the

fluctuations and spikes in the price of oil and

can afford to live in communities far away from

polluting power plants.

I moved to Hull this past March and the value of my house has increased \$20,000 already. Property values are increasing and Hull continues to be a very desirable place to live and to visit. The turbine in Hull has excellent educational benefits. The study of wind power and technology behind the wind power has been integrated into the science, history, and mathematics curriculum at the Hull high school.

The opposition will argue that, unlike Hull, where we just have one, this project proposal is to build a lot more than a single turbine. This is true, but the Cape Wind turbines are going to be offshore, visible only on the clearest of days.

Our wind turbine in Hull is always visible. There is no hiding it or pretending it's not there, but yet every time I look at it, I am reminded that every kilowatt produced by it is one kilowatt that is not costing us a single cent or a single soldier battling overseas to secure our energy supply.

Thank you very much.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Our next speaker, Gabriel Shapiro.

GABRIEL SHAPIRO: Hi. My name is Gabriel Shapiro. I am the co-director of the Boston chapter of Clean Power Now.

I'd first like to thank the Army Corps for holding a hearing here in Cambridge. I think it is very important to recognize the effects of the proposed wind farm in Nantucket Sound reach far beyond the Cape and the Islands.

Some are concerned about the view of these structures. I appeal to all who are concerned about the view of what will appear of a small group of half inch structures on the horizon

to expand their view in looking past the horizon.

Look past the horizon to here in Boston and Cambridge where the air quality is directly effected by the pollutant from fossil fuel burning plants that will be backed down due to the energy production of the wind farm.

This project will prevent 360 tons of particulate matter that worsens conditions such as Asthma from being released into the air. Look past the horizon to the entire state of Massachusetts which will benefit from taking a great giant step towards reaching its own renewable energy portfolio that requires approximately 1,000 megawatts of renewable energy generating capacity by 2009.

The wind farm's 420 megawatts capacity meets over 40 percent of this requirement. Look past the horizon to our great nation. The Army Corps estimates that the benefits of the U.S. economy from this project will be in the range of \$1.5 to \$2 billion.

And finally, look past the horizon to our global community where our actions or inactivity effects the rest of the world. As the

largest producers of greenhouse gases in the world, we have the largest responsibility to take action immediately. This project will prevent a hundred, one million tons of carbon dioxide from being released into the air annually.

And also, look past the horizon to the next generation as our Governor, whose hypocrisy in opposing this project is astounding, wrote in a letter introducing the Massachusetts Climate Protection plan which includes measures like the renewable energy portfolio standard I mentioned before. "These actions we can and must take now. We are to have no regrets when we transfer our temporary stewardship of this earth to the next generation."

In closing, let me urge all of you to let the Army Corps process run its course. Let us be a model for the rest of the country to show them that economically, viable, impactful, renewable, energy projects are possible to produce now and not before it is too late. Look past the horizon. There's a whole world out there, and it is worth saving.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Ladies and gentlemen, if you need to know where you are in the cue, there is a printout by the registration table, and I ask you not to block any of the access. There are fire marshals here. And if you would like to make a statement with the additional stenographer, please do. It's a good time to do it.

We will start back at 9:30 p.m. on the minute.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, a break was taken.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: I believe one of the staff took the walkie-talkie that's here. Individuals that are in the breakout room or the overflow room, you can start making your way back down here. We do have some seats open, and whoever borrowed the walkie-talkie, if you could return it for my staff.

Sir, if we're ready? Stenographer?

Next speaker is City Councilor from Cambridge,

Massachusetts, Henrietta Davis, who will be

followed by Karen Deady.

 $\label{eq:henrietta} \mbox{ HENRIETTA DAVIS: I'm a little too} \\ \mbox{short, I guess.}$

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: The former City
Councilor--

(Laughter.)

HENRIETTA DAVIS: The former microphone. The City Councilor's fine. Well, first of all, I want to welcome you to Cambridge. I'm so glad to see you all here today.

I'm Henrietta Davis. I'm a City

Councilor, and I'm the legislative liaison to the

International Conference for local environmental

initiatives for the City of Cambridge.

I want to welcome you to Cambridge and the Boston area, in particular, because this is the birthplace of the American Revolution, and I think what you see here tonight is the beginning of a new American Revolution, the clean energy revolution, the revolution that we all need to have a healthy safe future for ourselves and for our children.

Here, in the City of Cambridge, we have taken the step of developing a Climate Action Plan to decrease our CO2 emissions by 20 percent by

2010. We're doing all kinds of good things. We have a municipal policy that says all new buildings will be built as green buildings. We have, we recycle at 40 percent, at the 40 percent rate.

We are partnering up with the universities. We're limiting the amount of transportation we do by single occupancy vehicles, but one thing we don't have control over is the generation of renewable energy, and this project represents to us the possibility of having clean renewal energy be part, a significant part, of the city's portfolio, a significant part of the region's portfolio, and it's something that we don't see happening even though it's required by the state dereg statutes. It's not really happening.

We need the help of something like this wind power project to make things go forward. I urge you to support this project, to address the valid environmental concerns that have been raised, and I know you're having many hearings and have heard many things that I know you'll be thinking about, but I think, in the long run, what

you need to do is permit this project and get us moving on the new American Revolution for clean renewable energy.

Thank you very much.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.

Next speaker, Karen Deady followed by Charles Kleekamp.

I'm a resident of Concord, Massachusetts, and a member of Clean Power now. Professionally, I'm a certified industrial hygienist and have worked in the field of environmental health and safety since 1977.

I suggest that a topic be included in the Final EIS that is not addressed in the draft, and that is to add a section on the relative hazards of the low toxicity transformer oil to be used in the wind farms' transformers compared to the more toxic, heavy residual fuel oil transported through the canal for power plan electrical generation.

To be specific, I will comment on a typical transformer oil, a product of FINA called DIEKAN 400. The product is a highly refined

paraffinic oil. Its potential health hazard level is that of a mild irritant. It contains no PCBs or known carcinogens, mutagens, teratogens or reproductive toxins.

The transformer oil is not a flammable liquid. It has a flashpoint of 295 degrees

Fahrenheit, and is a Class IIIB combustible. Its emergency response NFPA fire rating is one, which defines it as a material that will not burn in air until exposed to a temperature of 1,500 degrees

Fahrenheit for a period of five minutes.

Accidental release of the wind farm's transformer oil is very unlikely due to triple wall containment and the platform structural integrity and the location in the central shallow water making it next to impossible for large deep draft vessels to collide with it.

I request that the Final EIS include a discussion of the relative probability of an oil spill from the wind farm transformers compared to the probability of another moving oil barge or tanker incident and the associated environmental damage from each.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

2 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.

Next speaker, Charles Kleekamp followed by Lynn Nadeau.

CHARLES KLEEKAMP: Thank you. My name is Charles Kleekamp. I'm a retired professional electrical engineer, and I'm the Information Director of Clean Power Now supporting the Cape Wind project.

I would like to suggest the Army include in its Final EIS a topic not addressed in the current document, and that is, a perspective on the issue of private use of public property.

Although Cape Wind has said that they will pay any congressionally imposed lease or royalty imposed on future wind farm, the fact remains that there are many policy precedents that should be considered in your balanced permit decision, and they are:

Number one, there are no fees for federal fishing permits in federal waters. This extractive one billion dollar industry in New England allows the taking of our fish for free.

Number two, it is the policy of the

current administration to give away totally royal free our natural gas extracted from a class of new deep gas wells in the Gulf of Mexico for the next five years saving energy companies a billion dollars. It is the policy of the government to continue the Federal Mining Act of 1872 to sell mining patents, essentially, deeds to the property at \$5 an acre, although not free, but close to it.

A case in point, the current administration sold to Phelps-Dodge Corporation, in April, 155 acres of prime mountain top real estate in the Gunnison National Forest near a Colorado ski resort for \$875. In this area, land sells on the open market for a million dollars an acre. It is ironic that Mr. Doug Yearly, the former president of Phelps-Dodge, now living in Osterville, is the president of the Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound.

It is our government policy to give free passage to any commercial or private vessel passing through the Cape Cod Canal maintained a public expense by the Army Corps, in essence, a free use case.

I would respectfully like to ask the

Army Corps to include a balanced perspective on current cases of private use of public property in the Final EIS, as it is in the public interest to bring the enormous benefits of this wind power project to fruition.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Lynn Nadeau followed by Nadine (sic) Scammel.

LYNN NADEAU: Thank you. I'm Lynn Nadeau, a retired mathematics teacher from the Greater Salem area.

I'm an initiator of Health Link, a citizen action organization, working to reduce toxins in our environment.

Having worked hard to pass and enforce Massachusetts regulations on coal and oil fueled power plants, we know the true costs of these two extractive fuels from their resting from the earth to their eventual reinternment.

We support the project. I want to call your attention, as others have, to the big picture of the impact of each fuel on our lives and

habitat.

Inspired by the color coded system of our Federal Government to warn us of terrorists and other hidden dangers, I created a little chart that I just wanted to submit, and it's kind of a little bit of the seat of the pants chart, but I did do quite a bit of research to fill in the colors.

This illustrates, actually, there's six different, seven different fuel sources on the rows and six different impacts on the columns, and then I weighted them according to colors with red being the, dark red being the worst and green being the best.

What it shows is that, if you consider the fuel sources, coal, nuclear, oil, natural gas, solar, hydro and wind, I actually forgot about trash that somebody reminded me of, and the issues terrorist impact disaster, health impacts under ordinary operation cost the taxpayers, there I put in the numbers, for subsidies, global warming impact, waste disposal impact and environmental damage, including birds, bats and the Benthic Layer, the colors show illustratively the impact

of each one of these, and I just urge you to look at that and to think about the big picture.

One more second. I just want to say something about the City of Lynn, which is working to put in two -- never mind.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker-(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Okay. Madeleine, and Madeleine will be followed by Cindy Keegan.

MADELEINE SCAMMEL: Thank you. My name is Madeleine Scammel, and I am a doctoral candidate in environmental health at the School of Public Health at Boston University, but I'm not speaking on their behalf. I'm speaking as someone who grew up on the Cape, in Orleans, and, also, sort of, in Chelsea, Massachusetts, where my mother lived, where I did not go to school, but where I often visited.

These are two drastically different areas. If you're familiar with either one of them, you can imagine. I'll just say Chelsea probably had a pristine creek at one time. It's

not now. It is not. It's anything from pristine, but I feel strong emotion, like many people in this room, about this project.

I did grow up on the Cape. The ocean is the thing I value most probably in the world, next to my family, and the clean horizon, and I realize that it's the uncertainties in the proposal that make me nervous, but no power plant proposal is without uncertainty.

Pilgrim Power Plant is a case in point, another power plant we're all familiar with, if we live on the Cape, and today, I heard on the news about the Hanford site, possibly the most contaminated hazardous waste site in the country. The residents of Hanford, Washington, the officials there, are being sued by the Federal Government for refusing to accept contaminated waste any longer.

They no longer have a choice, but we do, and despite the uncertainties about marine impact and wildlife, the certain with regards to health impacts of existing power sources is very clear: asthma rates, cancer rates, cardiac diseases.

There's no question about the impact of

our current power sources on our health, and we have to stand behind Cape Wind and this proposal with any conscience for the people of tomorrow.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next -- I was informed that Cindy Keegan has left, so our next speaker will be Constantine Jamoylenko. I know I mispronounced that, so--

CONSTANTINE JAMOYLENKO: That's okay. You're not the first one.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: And, sir, you'll be followed by Susan Giordano.

CONSTANTINE JAMOYLENKO: My name is

Constantine Jamoylenko. I'm a mechanical engineer

and a resident of Concord, Massachusetts. I'm a

member of Clean Power Now supporting the wind

project on Nantucket Sound.

I would like to thank the Army Corps for this opportunity to comment on your comprehensive Draft EIS. You have appropriately documented the fact that the project could displace equivalent energy from fossil plants that would otherwise

annually mean a million tons of carbon dioxide, a major contributor to global warming.

However, I would like to suggest that you put this somewhat nebulous number in context to show the benefit to the public interest.

For example, if two of the largest fossil fueled power plants in Massachusetts, Brayton Point and Canal Plant, which together mean approximately fourteen million pounds of CO2 a year, were to reduce their combined electrical generation by the amount of the new wind farm generation, the reduction of the one million tons of CO2 will be 7 percent.

This is enough for these two large power plants, in conjunction with the wind farm, to meet the Kyoto protocol reduction by 2010. No other single project, energy related or otherwise, can make such a substantial contribution to reducing greenhouse gases from Southeastern Massachusetts.

It is our obligation to future generations to do so. I would respectfully like to ask the Army Corps to incorporate in the Final EIS a discussion of relative impact on fossil power plants CO2 reduction which are definitely in

the public interest.

As an engineer, I was involved in alternative sources of energy development in the seventies, and as a nation, we squandered the opportunity when the oil became cheap again.

Let's not squander this opportunity.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Please, ensure that your entire statement is submitted for the record.

Next speaker is Susan Giordano followed by Smilia Marvosh.

SUSAN GIORDANO: Hi. My name is Susan Giordano. I'm the general manager of Second Wind, and for what it's worth, I cherish my two weeks a year on Martha's Vineyard. I appreciate the opportunity to speak this evening, note my natty green shirt to show my support for the project.

Second Wind is a wind energy electronics and software company based in Somerville,

Massachusetts. The company was established in

1980 before commercial wind farms became a reality.

Now, our instrumentation monitors over
5,000 utility scale wind turbines in the U.S. and
Europe. We have no commercial relationship with
Cape Wind, but we've been following the progress

of the Horseshoe Shoals project with great

6 interest.

Second Wind shares the position with the American Wind Energy Association and other local and national environmental groups that, responsibly done, the Horseshoe Shoals wind project will be an asset to the region.

Its wind turbines will offset imports of costly oil and gas with minimal footprint on the environment. Those able to see the turbines will interpret them as a symbol of Massachusetts' leadership in environmental policy.

Because we serve the commercial wind energy market, our company is not well known outside the wind industry, but that's my point. There has been some discussion of the jobs that will be generated by this project. Estimates of jobs created by wind projects range from a high of fifteen to nineteen direct and indirect jobs per megawatt of wind capacity to four point eight.

In my opinion, the complexity of an offshore wind project would create more jobs per megawatt than a land-based project.

In addition to windsmith jobs, servicing the turbines and hospitality jobs providing food and shelter to the technicians, a healthy wind industry provides high technology jobs, like the ones Massachusetts has lost to consolidation and offshoring, and these jobs are just as likely to be in small companies like ours as big companies, like General Electric.

Wind is a complex and dynamic power source, and sophisticated analysis is needed to make sure the turbines are capturing as much of that free fuel as possible. According to the Wisconsin Energy Bureau, wind energy facilities generate three times more jobs than conventional energy facilities.

Rather than spending millions of dollars a year--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am. SUSAN GIORDANO: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Please ensure the

entire statement is submitted for the record.

Next speaker is Similia Marvosh followed by Tedd Saunders. Ma'am?

SIMILIA MARVOSH: Hi. My name is
Similia Marvosh, and I'm here representing the
Coalition for the Health of Agri Industries
Neighbors in support of the Cape Wind project.

I am continually amazed at the ways in which many Americans continue to fight to preserve what is felt to be our high standard of living are the very ways which are destroying that diminishing standard by living in unsustainable ways to fail to replenish the resources that allow us to live up to such a high standard by attempting to solve today's problems with the same kind of thinking that created them, to steal a quote from Einstein.

Maintaining a high standard of living comes with responsibility, stewardship, conscience and compassion. Our grandchildren are going to wonder what on earth we were thinking to remain in such a long period of denial regarding the state of our deteriorating global environment when much of the rest of the world, including some so-called

undeveloped nations, are leaving us behind in terms of setting examples in sustainability for entire nations to be proud of.

The kind of technological and industrial advances that separate us from what gives us breath and engenders a delicate step on over-burdened planetary resources is a short-lived romp to more wars and cataclysmic weather events.

The pentagon report on potential security threats from climate change, hardly a liberal publication, or leftist propaganda, tells us that the threat from climate change could lead to place where the natural state of human affairs will be environmental wars.

The other side of our technological industrial advances, if combined with vision, wisdom, leadership, the best of human thinking, will lead us to a new and desperately needed way to live on the earth.

I am extremely disappointed that

Governor Romney, Attorney General Tom Reilly and

Senator Kennedy are not 100 percent behind Cape

Wind. Sometimes what is politically salient is

neither factual, nor courageous, let alone

visionary.

Sometimes the dissemination of disinformation out of convenience to the status quo rules the day. Most of our courage and vision does not come from people in office, but just plain people trying to do the right thing morally and ethically, as if they actually might get to come back one day and see their handiwork.

When Governor Romney says, "We cannot trash this extraordinary resources," his position against Cape Wind is doing exactly that, trashing an extraordinary resource by not committing to its survival.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am. SIMILIA MARVOSH: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Tedd Saunders, who will be followed by Stephanie Doiron.

TEDD SAUNDERS: Good evening. Thank you for having me here, and I just want to say this has been a phenomenal evening, and I commend everyone who's spoken so far tonight.

My name is Tedd Saunders, and I'm a

businessman, a lover of Cape Cod and one of the owners of the Saunders Hotel Group. I'm here because, if the truth be told, I have something to gain by this project getting approved.

In fact, your environmental report proves definitively that we all have something to gain from the approval of this innovative project.

As a hotel owner, I've studied this project for several years and its opponent's claim that it would lose tourism jobs. Everything I've read about tourism near other offshore projects shows that, contrary to SOS' fear mongering, tourism actually increases as curious travelers from far and wide come to see these sites and understand their charm, beauty and value.

Isn't it ironic that global climate change caused by reckless burning of fossil fuels will flood the very beaches and coastlines that Cape Cod relies upon for its economic survival.

As much as I love Cape Cod Sound, despite the fact that it is already a highly commercialized area teaming with large exhaust spewing ships of all kinds, this is not the Grand Canyon.

It is hard to understand how anyone who cares about the long term health of Cape Cod
Sound, and, in fact, Cape Cod, would work against this vital project when it will help make us less reliant on foreign oil, make the air cleaner that our children breathe and help protect the water, fishing and beaches from many devastating oil spills.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Stephanie Doiron followed by Frances Lowell.

STEPHANIE DOIRON: Hello. My name is

Stephanie Doiron, and I am speaking as a representative for myself tonight. I am in support of this project, and the answer is blowing in the wind.

As regards for health, Barnstable County has the worst air quality in the State of Massachusetts. Due to the fact that wind is free, the electric bills will decrease because less fuel will be burned. This will decrease polluting emissions which are the root cause of local

negative health effects which include twelve to fifteen premature deaths every year, some 200 emergency room visits, 5,000 asthma attacks and 35,000 cases of daily upper respiratory symptoms.

The dollar amount for these unnecessary afflictions is \$53,000,000 every year, and we are concerned with weapons of mass destruction.

Regarding energy supply, oil is the dominant source of fuel in Southeastern

Massachusetts where we have the largest power plants in the state. Wind power will reduce the amount of oil we need, which I see as a great first step to reducing our foreign dependency on oil.

As for the visual, it is the vision, not the view, and that new vision could very well make the Cape even more of a tourist attraction which would, in turn, boost local economy. I know I would be nothing more than proud to have America's first wind farm in my back yard.

In conclusion, as a concerned citizen of the actual general public and not a representative few, I view these turbines as a symbol of our innovation and our long overdue respect to our

mother earth, and I ask you, would you rather someone blow smoke in your mother's face or offer her a breath of fresh air? Because that is what Cape Wind is to me.

(Applause.)

 $\label{eq:stephanie} \mbox{STEPHANIE DOIRON: It is a breath of } \\ \mbox{fresh air.}$

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.
(Applause.)

STEPHANIE DOIRON: You're welcome.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Frances Lowell followed by Richard Thornton.

PETE LOWELL: Good evening. My name is Pete Lowell. I'm a Cape Cod resident since 1966. I've fished and cruised on Nantucket and Vineyard Sound since childhood. I live in Falmouth, and I'm a part-owner of land in Cotuit. My father's ashes are scattered on Nantucket Sound.

I'm an electrical engineer and retired owner of a small company that designed and manufactured underwater acoustic instrumentation.

Our company served the water resources and hydroelectric power industries. My work also took me to oil platforms in the North Sea and the Gulf

of Mexico.

I understand, both, the marine environment and electric power transmission and generation. Any thinking person has to be in favor of alternative energy, wind, solar, et cetera, but what is missing here is a national energy policy which can set the ground rules for projects such as this.

I'm opposed to sacrificing this unique unspoiled area for this enormous power plant, and if there are not other suitable locations, then offshore wind power is not going to be a viable industry in this country.

I've read enough of the EIS to see inaccuracies which make me wonder if the applicant has truly studied and understands their proposed operating environment.

Two examples. On Page 19 of the introduction, it says: "Cables are buried 6 feet below present bottom." How about sand waves that move during storms? Burial depths must be below the lowest sand wave trough.

Our company work boat lost an anchor in Vineyard Sound as it was hooked on a supposedly

buried power cable. The water is deeper in Vineyard Sound and less current than on Horseshoe Shoal. I have also seen pipelines supposedly buried in the North Sea bottom hanging several feet off the bottom between sand waves.

I believe this would be an even bigger problem on Horseshoe Shoal because it's shallower and has relatively strong currents, particularly, during storms. In my opinion, 6 foot depth of burial is simply inadequate. Twelve feet might be sufficient, but it would require more study to determine safe depths. The potential for ecological damage resulting from this deeper burial depth needs to be studied, also.

On Page 20, it states that the turbines "react to the wind, not changing the direction or speed." This cannot be true. If they do not change the wind speed, how do they extract energy from the wind and who do the turbines have to be spread over such a large area? Of course, the turbines reduce the--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir-PETE LOWELL: --wind speed in their
vicinity.

1 FROM THE FLOOR: Time.

FROM THE FLOOR: Time--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Please ensure the entire statement is submitted for the record.

Next speaker, Richard Thornton followed by Lori Segall.

RICHARD THORNTON: I'm Richard Thornton, Concord, Massachusetts. I'm not speaking for or against, but I want to identify problems with the proposal as it stands and suggest some alternative ways to deal with these problems.

I was a professor at MIT, taught courses here in solar energy, worked with students building electric cars, built a solar energy home. I've spent most of my life working on energy efficient transportation. I'm in favor, I favor alternate energy systems, but I see serious risk.

For example, we have a company that has no operational experience in designing, building and operating wind farms. They're proposing to build the largest U.S. offshore wind farm in the

country, using the largest wind turbines ever built and putting it where we have seen personally what the damage can be brought by hurricanes and tornados.

We are not being given, in the proposals to build, proof of concept. We're asking for another financial disaster for Massachusetts unless we can do the risk analysis.

We also have a financial problem. We're asked to invest resources, tax resources, real estate resources. We're not given the data in which we can do a due diligence that most investors would require from this kind of investment. We should be given all the numbers so we can hire consultants to determine whether this is a financially viable operation.

Now, my suggestions are very simple. To our political leaders, let's have a fast track legislation to pass legislation to how we allocate offshore resources. To the regulatory agencies, like the Corps of Engineers, let's do the due diligence and the risk analysis.

To the wind farm promoters, either wait until these first two recommendations are done or

move further off-stream and don't ask for subsidy.

To the Department of Energy, having studied solar energy in my life, I know the weakness is lack of storage. We cannot displace the power plants. We can only displace the fuel. Our president likes the idea of the hydrogen car. Let's develop offshore wind technology that can generate hydrogen from the wind. It's technically feasible.

And, finally, to the public organizations that promote this, the Union of Concerned Scientists and so forth, the people in this room, do the analysis. If you're willing to pay 1.8 cents a kilowatt hour for fuel not burned, and you don't know that the fuel won't be burned in this state, it could be not burned somewhere else, you should be willing to pay every hybrid car owner--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir-RICHARD THORNTON: --\$100 a year.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Lori Segall followed by Victoria Wesson.

LORI SEGALL: Hi. My name is Lori

Segall. I live in Somerville, Massachusetts.

When I first heard that a wind farm was proposed for Nantucket Sound, I became concerned. Cape Cod is a very special place to me. I've been vacationing there since I was a baby, and I spent a summer there working on an internship. I have a strong attachment to the Cape. The unobstructed views of beaches, dunes and salt marshes are priceless to me.

However, we Americans will not stand for power shortages, and we don't want to be told to cut our energy consumption. Our demand for power is increasing, and we will soon need new power capacity in our region. We can't expect this without paying some price. The price of wind power is the view. The price of the alternatives is much worse.

It is against my moral values to insist on having all the benefits of electricity on demand, but having someone else pay the price.

People who live near power plants are very sick of looking at those ugly monsters and breathing their bad air.

If opponents of this wind farm get their

way, we will collectively endure the consequences of getting, of another generating facility that runs on coal, oil, gas or nuclear power.

I challenge these opponents to tell prospective neighbors of a new coal or oil fired power plant that you think our view is more important than the air that they breathe every day. I challenge these opponents to tell prospective neighbors of a liquid natural gas port or nuclear power plant that our view is more important than their feeling of fear of a terrorist attack or even an accident that could cost them their lives.

I challenge these opponents to think about the conversation that you might have with your grandchildren when they ask you why our view is more important than the beaches they never got to enjoy because sea level rose due to global warming.

There will be opponents of the wind farm that will change the DEIS on a variety of issues.

I'm sure the work is not flawless. I would bet that the quality of work that went into this, knowing the level of scrutiny it would receive, is

far better than most of its kind.

My only critique of the DEIS is that—
MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.
(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you. I was informed that Ms. Wesson had to leave, so our next speaker is Deborah Donovan, who will be followed by Neil Good.

Ms. Donovan?

DEBORAH DONOVAN: Good evening. My name is Deborah Donovan, and I'm representing the Union of Concerned Scientists. We are a nonprofit alliance of 100,000 concerned citizens and scientists working on environmental solutions.

I want to thank you for having the hearing here tonight and congratulate the Corps and the sixteen other federal, state and local agencies on completing the Draft EIS for Cape Wind. We believe that this is now an important step towards moving the debate on to what the sound science is behind the impacts of this project.

UCS maintains that wind projects, including offshore sites, should be built if

rigorous review and studies show that there will be no significant unmitigated environmental impacts. With proper siting, careful design, comprehensive study, monitoring and mitigation, wind power can and should play a significant role in New England's electricity system.

UCS is currently reviewing the Draft EIS and will be submitting written testimony during the comment period. As a result, my testimony here does not present any final conclusions about the project.

However, we're quite encouraged by our initial review of the Corps' findings. We concur with the draft findings of many significant economic public health and environmental benefits. If the conclusions of the Draft EIS are supported in the Final EIS, USC believes the Cape Wind project should go forward.

If built, the Cape Wind project will contribute significantly to addressing many of the major problems our current electricity system poses, and those have been discussed at length by many other speakers here tonight.

One important effect will be to reduce

the physical and aesthetic degradation of areas that are producing the fossil fuels for our current fleet of power plants.

Today, we import all the fuel we need to satisfy our increasing demand for electricity. By doing so, we are exporting the impacts of our energy use to other communities cutting off the tops of mountains to get at coal, exploring for oil and gas in pristine areas or importing liquified natural gas from foreign countries.

These impacts are costly, risky and hugely damaging to the environment. If we choose fossil fuels over wind and other sources of renewable power, we will--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am-DEBORAH DONOVAN: --continue to cause
damage to the landscape.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Neil Good followed by Susan Nickerson.

NEIL GOOD: I'm going to read a condensed version of a handout that's available

outside. My name's Neil Good. I live in the Town of Mashpee.

For 300 years now, researchers have studied two Icelandic sagas, the Greenlander saga-FROM THE FLOOR: Can't hear--

NEIL GOOD: --and the saga of Eric the Red with the goal of resolving one of history's greatest mysteries. Where along the coastline of North America did Norsemen and women explore and eventually settle in the 11th Century?

They named the area Vinland, land of wine, and occupied it off and on over the course of about 20 years.

Just 40 years ago, skeptics dismissed these two sagas a folk tales, but today, all the researchers agree the accounts are based on actual events and are the earliest written descriptions of the new world.

Southern New England and Cape Cod, in particular, have been named the most probable location of Vinland by a majority of professional researchers. Over 30 scholars have placed Vinland on or near Cape Cod with many favoring sites directly on Nantucket Sound.

The list includes MIT Professor William Hovgaard, English Historian Dr. Gathorne-Hardy, Botanist Askell Love and Dr. Carl Ortwin Sauer, who is remembered today as the most influential figure of the 20th Century in the field of cultural geography.

New support for the theory that places

Norsemen on Nantucket Sound can be found on early

nautical charts of the Northeast Coast. These

early charts show that the area conforms to the

precise wording in the saga, more closely than

previously thought.

The Greenlander saga describes that, within a sound made up of extensive shallows, a large area ran dry at low tide. Over 300 years ago, the British navigational guide, the English Pilot, warned New England sailors that Horseshoe Shoal ran dry in places at low water.

Even today, the U.S. Atlantic pilot cautions mariners that Horseshoe Shoal bears in places at extreme low water.

The saga account is remarkably similar to the actual conditions past and present in Nantucket Sound. Cape Wind Associates is

proposing to build a power plant in the center of Nantucket Sound. They claim that the shallow water of Nantucket Sound is a key factor leading them to identify the sound as the only area on the Northeast Coast with the characteristics that they are looking for.

A similar argument could be made in favor of preserving Nantucket Sound. Nantucket Sound is the only area along the Northeast Coast with all the characteristics of the picture set down in the Greenlander's saga.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,
Susan Nickerson followed by Stephen Macausland.

SUSAN NICKERSON: Good evening. I'm
Susan Nickerson, a resident of Cape Cod and
Executive Director of the Alliance to Protect
Nantucket Sound, an organization that represents
over 20,000 opponents to the Cape Wind project.

Over the past few weeks, the alliance has begun its technical review of the Cape Wind DEIS. Tonight, I would like to bring to your attention a matter that has direct bearing on your

assessment of the benefit of the Cape Wind project, and that is the issue of air pollution.

The DEIS appears to seriously overstate the air pollution benefits of the Cape Wind project. In Section 5.15, the DEIS claims that Cape Wind, if constructed, would reduce air pollutant emissions in New England by about 1,200 tons of nitrogen oxides and about 4,000 tons of sulphur oxides per year.

These conclusions rest on what we see as an incorrect interpretation of how the nation's air pollution control system works.

We raise with you tonight the question of whether Cape Wind will reduce nitrogen and sulphur oxide emissions at all, and here's why.

In the past 15 years, Congress and EPA have adopted cap and trade programs to clamp down on power plant emissions. Such programs forbid power plants in the aggregate to emit more than a defined cap amount of pollution; however, they do provide that pollution allowances can be bought and sold by electricity generators.

Given the dynamics of the air emission cap and trade system, we do not see how Cape Wind

would have any effect on nitrogen and sulphur oxide emissions. Existing plants in New England will still have to operate and emit to meet New England's power demands. Those emissions will always be controlled by the cap.

Bringing Cape Wind on line would not do anything to change that situation as emission levels will always rise to the established cap. The way to achieve further reductions in power plant emissions is through direct control of emissions, either individually or by lowering the overall cap.

In short, there appears to be no direct link between constructing Cape Wind and reductions in oxide emissions in New England. We request the Army Corps review this component of the DEIS and make an independent judgment on the air quality benefits of the Cape Wind project.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,

23 Stephen Macausland followed by Marlon Banta.

STEVE MACAUSLAND: Steve Macausland,

Massachusetts Interfaith Power and Light. You thought you'd heard it all; hadn't you?

Three years ago, a number of religious institutions in Massachusetts came together on the subject of global warming. From those initial meetings was born an organization called Massachusetts Interfaith Power and Light, and today, I am here to give witness to our resolve that global warming is one of the greatest challenges the human race has ever faced and that the Cape Wind project must go forth.

As people of faith, we are all called in different ways to love our God and to love our neighbors. Today, we are here to discuss energy. What is the connection?

After love, it is energy that makes the world go around. Everything we do uses energy, and the energy industry has helped to make this country great. Unfortunately, our energy dependence has produced some very serious side effects.

Do we love our neighbors when our use of electricity seriously impacts the health of the poor who live in the shadow of coal burning power

plants? Do we move our neighbors when our consumption of foreign oil contributes significantly to conflict around the world? And do we love our neighbors when our emission of greenhouse gases changes the very climate on this fragile earth, our island home?

Through the practice of energy conservation and investment in energy efficiency, congregations and members of Massachusetts

Interfaith Power and Light are saving more than enough money to afford cleaner sources of energy.

Together, we are saving energy, saving money, saving the planet, protecting the peace, protecting human health and creating jobs, too.

As we gain strength in the marketplace and in the halls of political power, we will have a voice as to where the jobs go and who gets them.

We are here to use that voice today.

This is not just a ministry for the environment,
but a call--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir-STEVE MACAUSLAND: --to love and justice
for all.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: The next speaker is Marlon Banta.

MARLON BANTA: Hello. My name is Marlon Banta. I'm one of the co-directors of the Boston Chapter of Clean Power Now, and I'm wearing green today to show my support for the Cape Wind project.

I would like to thank the Army Corps of Engineers for their thorough and comprehensive study which provides us with more environmental data on Nantucket Sound than has ever existed before.

The study underscores what we all have known, which is that the Cape Wind project will have tangible benefits to the environment, to the health of local residents and wildlife, to our energy stability and to the local economy with no negative impact on tourism or property values.

I share in the frustration that the Army Corps must feel when their study is deemed biased and unscientific by a well-funded opposition that has pushed the same subjective argument of aesthetics before and after the release of the statement.

I would encourage those people to acknowledge the Army Corps' efforts and, at least, to actually read the executive summary of the study.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Though the DEIS points to enormous beneficial offsets and health care costs and fossil fuel spending, I think it should also consider the other true costs of our current method of electricity production, costs which do not appear on our monthly bill, costs such as government energy subsidies and tax credits to fossil fuel and nuclear power producers which outweigh the subsidies to renewables by a factor of twenty, costs such as the estimated \$160 billion for health care costs related to generating electricity from coal alone, not to mention the 1,500 coal miners that die each year of Black Lung Disease, costs such as the military campaigns in some way support our dependency on foreign oil

The current price tag for the war in Iraq is \$150 billion and is estimated to reach \$210 billion in 2005. Costs such as increases in property insurance premiums for houses in affected

areas, I'm sorry, in areas affected by the real and existing problem of global climate change.

I pay for these costs every day through taxes, through national debt to increase health and property insurance premiums. The Cape Wind project is a proven technology that will be an important precedent setting step in mitigating these costs.

To those who say, "Not in my backyard," as a Mass. taxpayer, it's my backyard, too, and the cost of your fear and unfunded opposition to progress should not come out of my back pocket.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Niaz Dorry followed by Barbara Birdsey.

NIAZ DORRY: Hi. My name is Niaz Dorry, and I live in Gloucester, Massachusetts, and I'm here representing Greenpeace tonight. Greenpeace is an international organization with quite a few million members just here in the states and is in support of the Cape Wind project.

Greenpeace's decision to support the

project didn't come lightly. It came after being in the center of the wind discussion in Europe, particularly, with the Denmark, Germany and United Kingdom projects that have been underway and, also, after 30 years of working to try to stop dumping, drilling and all kinds of things that we feel have been detrimental to our marine ecosystem.

In addition, we looked at the draft environmental impact assessment and felt, at this point, we could actually extend our support to the project, but there's also another reason why Greenpeace is supporting the project, and that had to do with a subject that really hasn't been talked about much tonight, and that's the impact of fossil fuel on the economies of small scale fishing industries or small scale fishing communities, excuse me.

Quite a while ago, Greenpeace made a decision that there's a difference between people who make a living and people who make a killing from the sea, and we've chosen to support the small scale fleet, and we find, in the last ten years that I've been working on fisheries issues

alone, I've seen the impact of fossil fuel on this fishing industry's economy with, at least, half a dozen oil spills that are already undergoing, that are still undergoing claims for the lobster men in Rhode Island with, at least, the emissions of much of the mercury that's coming that's actually causing a lot of boycotts of the products of fishermen, in terms of tuna and swordfish.

So, here we have one industry alone that's affecting the economy of an industry on the ocean that we feel is the most ecologically responsible industry, and while searching one thing that we have control over, and that's the kind of power we use, we can actually empower that industry to actually be more viable and enrich their economies while making sure that we don't contribute any further to our addiction to fossil fuel.

I appreciate your time tonight and the hearing tonight, and Greenpeace, I'm sure, will be submitting more detailed comments to the environmental impact assessment, but I'll submit this for the record.

Thank you very much.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: 1 Thank you, ma'am. 2 (Applause.) 3 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, 4 Barbara Birdsey followed by Eric Chivian. 5 (No response.) MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Ms. Birdsey? 6 7 FROM THE FLOOR: She's gone. MODERATOR ROSENBERG: No. Okay. 8 I'm 9 sorry. 10 Sir? 11 DR. ERIC CHIVIAN: I am Dr. Eric 12 Chivian, a professor and director of the Center 13 for Health and the Global Environment at Harvard Medical School. I shared the 1985 Nobel Peace 14 15 prize. I am testifying tonight strongly in 16 17 favor of Cape Wind. Just what is at stake here? 18 The record increase in average global temperatures 19

favor of Cape Wind. Just what is at stake here?

The record increase in average global temperatures over the past century and the associated changes in global climate have already had profound global impacts on human health, including torrential rains and flooding, drought and more violent storms causing drowns and traumatic injuries and affecting water supplies in agriculture, heat

20

21

22

23

24

waves, such as that during the summer of 2003 which killed over 14,000 people in France, alone, almost five World Trade Center equivalents, worsening air pollution triggering asthma attacks and causing sickness and death in those with chronic heart and lung disease and the spread of some human infectious diseases, like Lyme and West Nile Virus Diseases.

The changes that we have seen to date are the result of an average warming of the earth's surface by only 1 degree Fahrenheit. What will happen if the earth warms by over 10 degrees Fahrenheit, which is a worse case scenario predicted for the year 2100?

If we do not curb our appetites for fossil fuel starting now, and embrace major renewable energy projects like Cape Wind, then global warming and climate change will continue to accelerate at great rates, and human health will be catastrophically impacted in coming decades.

If we defeat this project, we will have foreclosed an important first step toward protecting our children's health, and we will have made a tragic and shamefully ignorant mistake.

1 | Thank you.

2 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Patrick O'Shea. Patrick O'Shea, who will be followed by Charles Fiesel.

Sir?

PATRICK O'SHEA: Hello, hello. My name is Patrick O'Shea from Belchertown, Mass. I represent myself, my kids, my kids' unborn kids and their unborn kids until the end of time.

How will history judge us? By saying, no, to this project, we send a clear signal that the price of oil is not yet too high. We are in Iraq for the second time in 10 years with the lofty and, hopefully, obtainable goal of bringing democracy to Iraq, but I have to ask myself: Why are we so quick to be in Iraq twice?

We waited a long time before even giving air support in Kosovo. We are sitting on the sidelines in Sudan, and the Horn of Somalia we left after we only took on a few casualties, but for some reason, we've really dug in our heels with Iraq. Our will to take a stand in world

affairs and to look after people is co-mingled with our self interest, and in this case, it is oil.

Let us first recall some historical highlights of America and the Middle East. We backed the Shah of Iran, known to be a brutal dictator, before he was overthrown and the Ayatollah Khomeini was put in power back in the seventies, and now they hate us.

We also backed Saddam Hussein, and, well, today, we are paying for that mistake. We also backed the present government of Saudi Arabia. This country always makes the list of one of the top ten countries of having the worst record of human rights views. And then we wonder why they hate us so much.

I, personally, do not wonder why. I feel that perhaps I would be shouting anti-American slogans, or worse, if I was brought up in the Middle East.

By developing wind technology, U.S. can keep jobs and dollars that would otherwise be funneled to Middle East countries. Although some of this money does seem to make its way back to

us, it's just too bad that it's in funding terrorist activities.

Over 225 years ago, a group of people, some of them right here from this area, thought that the price of being a colony was too high and wrote up the Declaration of Independence. They did not achieve this goal right away, but they did achieve it.

This year, we can decide that the price of oil is too high, and we can start declaring our energy independence. Recalling what John F.

Kennedy once said, who comes from Hyannis, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but rather"--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir-PATRICK O'SHEA: --"what can you do for
your country."

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Charles Fiesel to be followed by Timothy Dale.

CHARLES FIESEL: Good evening. My name is Charles Fiesel. I am on the Board of Directors of the Adirondack Mountain Club, the Adirondack

Park Conservancy. I am on the Strategic Planning Committee for the Adirondack Park. I am the founder of the Boston Chapter of the Adirondack Mountain Club.

I'm going to just read a few excerpts of this. As responsible citizens, stewards and advocates, the Adirondack Mountain Club strongly supports public policies and private projects that advance energy conservation and efficiency.

We support the development of wind farms as a renewable energy source to offset the effects of global climate changed produced by the burning of fossil fuels; however, we believe that these efforts must be developed under the guidance of responsible research that does not overlook major components of our ecosystem.

On November 9th, Mass. Audubon began its review of the Long awaited 4,000 page DEIS. As proposed, Cape Wind would be the first offshore wind farm in North America. The review standard is the construction of an operation of 130 Cape Wind turbines on Horseshoe Shoal should pose no undo mortality risks for avian and marine wildlife there or significantly lower its habitat value.

ュ

The conclusion reached in the DEIS is the project will likely cause 364 deaths per year. I would just like to, because I have a lot of data here, I, I think that the fact that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, in concert with the Mass. Audubon, has suggested, as partners with you for three years of research, that one year of research for migrating birds is just not enough, but we should take it a step back further.

The one year that was done is actually, folks, seven weeks. You need to know that. Look at the fine print. It's three weeks in the spring, four weeks in the fall.

Then underneath, under their Migratory
Bird Act, we need to really, you know, think about
the birds, and I'm not here, you know, it's kids
from the Bronx. You know, I'm not trying to like,
you know, be just a bird lover and shut this
project down, but we need to take these acts that
are very important into consideration here.

We are supporting wind projects throughout the Adirondacks, but this must be developed under the guidance of programs that are thoughtful.

1 Thank you. 2 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. 3 (Applause.) 4 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Timothy Doe -- Dale followed by Michael Charney. 5 6 (No response.) 7 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Michael Charney? DR. MICHAEL CHARNEY: I'm Dr. Michael 8 9 Charney. I'm a physician practicing in Boston and 10 environmentalist as well. 11 I come because I support the issue of 12 protecting the planet from global climate change. 13 I encourage the Army Corps to follow what many have said today about the lack and, 14 15 corrected, the lack of detailed mention of the real effects of climate change which would be 16 17 foregone if we used wind power as opposed to going ahead with further fossil fuel or other kinds of 18 19 power plants, which is nuclear. 20 Each of your sections, whether it's in 21 Section 5, whether it's water depth, waves, 22 salinity, currents, sediment, transport, ph isn't 23 mentioned, the chemistry of the water, you don't

mention exotics coming in and so forth,

24

shorelines, storm flood plains.

We're not going to be dealing with typical 100 year flood plains any more or storms and storm surges. We're seeing an increasing frequency of those. Those are becoming 25 or 50 year occurrences as opposed to 100 year.

With climate change happening, you have an opportunity to set a precedent in this report that every future DEIS of power plant siting in federal lands and waters shall seriously, in detail, indicate the climate change impacts foregone or created by the use of that power source.

And in this case, I think it's a very simple matter to, for example, include the National Academy of Sciences, a report on climate change, look to the IPCC and quote liberally from there and even, for everyone here, go look at the September issue of National Geographic to see what real climate change environmental impact is going to be like and is like right now.

I highly recommend you look at that, and I hope that you members of the Board have already looked at that, but each of these I think you can

easily say, at the end of each of these, there will be no alterations of salinity, ph, current, salinity, waves and water depth with wind, but with any other power plant and many of which or perhaps all of the power plants which your organization, which your Board, has sited or permitted to be sited, and the power plants and the cables and the pipelines that have gone in federal waters, all of them endanger the planet.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,

Gerald (sic) Desautels followed by Mike Flanagan.

GERARD DESAUTELS: Good evening. My name is Gerard Desautels, and I speak tonight as a private citizen and Boston and Cape Cod taxpayer.

I'm here to advocate a deeper water solution which we all can be behind. There's a lot of energy here tonight, and I think a lot of people would be happy to support Jim Gordon, if we could all find a solution we could live with together.

I live on the Outer Cape. I moved there five years ago from Boston to an area famous for

its protected national seashore coastline, and while I appreciate the fact that much time, energy and money has gone into the release of the DEIS, it's safe to say, as you all know, the Cape and Islands came out last week in heavy opposition to this project.

I liken the issuance of this mammoth document to a host inviting a guest to dinner and asking them what they would like to eat without any intention to change their preset multi-course menu.

In this case, Cape Wind is our host who's trying to force every bite down our mouths. Last week, we heard from large Cape based public and private contingents opposing the project, elected officials and other organizations in vehement opposition, including Chambers of Commerce, the Mashpee Wampanoag Indians who claim the land as their own, the International Wildlife Coalition and a host of others.

All of them reject this project on multiple levels. No one last week rejected the concept of renewable energy. In fact, many spoke out and suggested ways Cape Wind could develop

other ventures that would more directly benefit 1 2 Cape communities or even yet hold off for a deeper 3 water project that would become more viable within the decade. 4 Colonel Koning, Ms. Adams, Mr. Hunt, the 5 6 people of Cape Code and the Islands have spoken. 7 Despite how Cape Wind tries to spin it, we don't need experts to tell us our opinion. The people 8 who surround Nantucket Sound do not want this 9 10 project in an area enveloped by state marine 11 sanctuary waters. 12 I urge you, on behalf of the Alliance to 13 Protect Nantucket Sound, to listen to the 14 majority--15 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir--GERARD DESAUTELS: -- of Cape and 16 17 Islanders. 18 (Applause.) 19 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Mike 20 Flanagan to be followed by Chrissy Tacker. Mike 21 Flanagan? 22 (No response.) 23 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Chrissy Tacker? 24 (No response.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Jennifer Baldwin?

Ms. Baldwin will be followed by Roberta Murphy.

JENNIFER BALDWIN: Hi. I'm Jennifer
Baldwin. I'm a student at Tufts University, an
environmentalist and, also, a Massachusetts
resident. My comments aren't specifically about
the impact statement, since it's been a busy
semester, and I haven't read it yet.

I've seem to have always grown up with power plants in my backyard, as a resident of Medway, Massachusetts, in Representative Paul Loscocco's district, who spoke earlier.

There's a power plant down our street, in Bellingham, Massachusetts, which we've always had to look at, as well as, at Tufts University, which is on a nice little hill, a drumlin, actually, created by glaciers. You have a nice view of the Mystic generating facility, a very large oil burning power plant, and that actually is just about the same size as Boston.

So if you guys have a chance to check it out, it's kind of in a lot of people's views since this area is one of the most populated in the country.

Anyway, I first got involved with the Cape Wind project after writing a very long paper about it last fall. Our class was supposed to look at all the benefits and potential impacts of the paper, and out of nine groups, all of them found that the benefits outweighed the detriments, even though we aren't necessarily residents of the Cape or the Islands.

But since then, I got involved in activism, and I'm a member of the climate campaign, a group of Northeast students who are trying to get universities to buy renewable energy, and I'm currently trying to get Tufts University to purchase some sort of wind power in any amount, and cost is one of the main factors that goes into that since it costs extra to purchase wind.

We need the supply. We need more supply to have, to bring the price down, in the long run, but even then, over 50 colleges and universities already purchase wind power in some sort of another. Check out, I mean, Community Energy's Web site for one.

We want our power, while we're on

campus, to be environmentally and socially responsible, and the last thing is that having a huge wind power plant like this could provide educational opportunities, like visits--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am--JENNIFER BALDWIN: --to the power plant. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,
Roberta Murphy. You're right after Ms. Murphy.
Okay? If she's here. Roberta--

ROBERTA MURPHY: I'm right here.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you.

ROBERTA MURPHY: Thank you for letting me speak. I really appreciate the fact that we can all come out here and give our different views on everything.

A little bit of background on myself.

Years ago, way before a lot of you here, I was here in these halls, and my husband was attending. He was studying nuclear planning, and we all know where that has gone and what is remaining of a lot of places. I lived in Maine for 10 years which, by the way, has, in five islands, particularly, the highest ozone count in the country, and that

is a direct result of the emissions from the Midwest and Asia, industry that we have no control over right now, and it is not going away.

Wiscassett is a ghost town. That's where the nuclear power plant was. This whole move for the wind energy jump so quickly really scares me because it, to me, seems like we have really not thought this out.

The study is flawed. The test tower, itself, broke. The readings were not taken from there. They were taken from Horns Rev, in Denmark, which has no relation to Horseshoe Shoal.

To me, coming from scientific background, if one point is flawed, the entire study is flawed and needs to be done again.

That's just what I was taught.

Number two, Homeland Security and your own study says that traffic will be allowed around the turbines, not through it, not in it. It will be a secured zone. It is a power plant, so everyone thinking that they can go boating and fishing is incorrect. This will be a protected area, and that's not being addressed, and I think a lot of people here will see.

You know, I agree with the green energy.

I ran Don Kent's Solar Energy Store, in Weymouth,
in the seventies, and I've had a solar house, and
I had a wind turbine in my backyard. I have a
Clevis Moultrum, and I had on demand hot water. I
had everything that I could. I built my own--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.

ROBERTA MURPHY: I'm done. All right.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Chrissy Tacker who will be followed by Malia Milligan.

Deanna Tacker: Hi. I'm Deanna. This is actually my sister Chrissy, and this is Eddie Collins. We're here representing ourselves, and we're against this wind project.

We are opposed because throughout our lives, we've been taught not to take what you don't earn and what isn't yours, and this is something not just instilled in us by our parents or by our teachers. This is something instilled in our generation by our society.

This situation leaves my generation

confused. We're being told one thing, and Cape Wind is showing us another. They are claiming land that isn't theirs, and they're planning on building on this land. If this farm is built, then it will go against what the world is trying to teach us, and the rule will have changed.

Don't take what isn't yours unless you're Cape Wind, and to me, that doesn't sound right, and I hope it doesn't sound right to you guys. We're not wealthy homeowners. I've heard a lot of people saying that we are.

I actually come from Wareham, and I don't know if anybody's ever really been to Wareham. Wareham's not really that nice of a place. We're all from Wareham, actually, and the majority of the people that actually spoke at the last one, I noticed, they weren't wealthy either. We're just every day people, and we want to protect what is ours.

This, to us, this sound is like your backyard. Yes, it is our backyard, but you putting wind turbines in our backyard is like us putting trash in yours, and it's just, it's polluting what we love, and you wouldn't want us

to pollute something that you love.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,
Malia Milligan to be followed by Audra Parker.

MALIA MILLIGAN: Hello. My name's Malia Milligan, and I'm a research associate with the Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound.

I'm strongly opposed to the Cape Wind project for many reasons, but the one I would like to address tonight is the European experience with offshore wind. We need to learn from and build upon what limited experience there is in this area.

The U.S. is extremely inexperienced with wind technologies. We have only 15 percent of wind developments worldwide, all of which are on land. Only 2 percent of wind power worldwide is situated offshore. European countries have far greater experience with wind developments. The U.K. alone has 93 wind projects, three operational offshore projects and numerous more in the planning process.

So what can European experience teach us? First, turbines can interfere with radar and sacrifice air safety. In the U.K., nearly half of all wind plant applications are rejected because of concerns with civil aviation air safety and defense systems.

The British Ministry of Defense has found that turbines can confuse radar systems.

The Cape is home to PAV/PAWs, part of the early warning network for missile defense.

Second, wind developments can be put in deep water very far from shore. The Moray Firth wind plant will be located 15 miles off the Northeast Coast of Scotland in water depths of over 130 feet. Negative impacts will be substantially reduced with increased distance from shore.

Third, public access is generally limited, if allowed at all. In the U.K., this project would be classified as higher risk due to its location in deeper water and placement within 500 yards of active shipping channels.

Due to this higher risk designation, there would be a declaration of area to be avoided

around the whole wind plant and up to 1,640 feet from the borders.

Using European experience as guidance, it is safe to assume that exclusionary zones of some sort may be required for the entire 20 to 25 year life of the project. Nantucket Sound is the wrong location for an industrial scale wind power plant. We need renewable energy, but we also need to protect our local resources.

I ask that the Army Corps consider the European experience and determine the risk to defense and air safety and identify possible access restrictions.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Audra Parker followed by Maria Simoneau.

AUDRA PARKER: I'm Audra Parker,
Assistant Director of the Alliance to Protect
Nantucket Sound and a resident of Cape Cod. Like
the majority of Cape and Island residents, I
oppose this project.

Nantucket Sound should not be turned

into an industrial experiment with uncertain economic safety and environmental impacts. We have better options.

The DEIS claims the wind plant would not hurt tourism or the Cape's economy, but the Beacon Hill Institute projects lost jobs and a significant reduction in tourism.

The impact statement concludes that turbines would be aids to navigation, but a study by a retired rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard finds a high likelihood of a marine casualty. The impact statement claims only 364 birds would be killed, but the Humane Society points out that bird kill could number in the thousands.

Offshore wind is an immature technology. The operating history that does exist shows numerous problems. Horns Rev, in Denmark, the largest offshore wind plant, is being dismantled for repairs.

Cape Wind's 3.6 megawatt technology is brand new used only in one small demonstration project in Ireland. What if a massive 130 unit plant is built in Nantucket Sound and it fails; what would be the cost to dismantle the plant and

restore the area; who would cover these costs; what decommissioning guarantees is Cape Wind making to protect the public?

The risks of the proposed project are great and the benefits are unclear. Let's take a less destructive path to satisfy our energy and clean air needs.

A Northeast Energy Efficiency
Partnership Report shows over 8,000 megawatts of
untapped energy efficiency potential available in
New England at a third of the cost of new supply.
I request that the Army Corps undertake an
evaluation of energy efficiency programs as an
alternative to the Cape Wind project so that we
don't have to threaten our economy, our safety and
our environment for a questionable 170 megawatts
of output.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,

22 | Maria Simoneau.

MARIA SIMONEAU: Hello. My name's Maria Simoneau, and I'm a member of Sustainable

Arlington, and we have voted to endorse the Cape Wind project.

First of all, I'd like to say that we recognize that conservation is equally as important as the development of renewable energy, and to that end, our town has recently installed new street lights, which will save the town an estimated \$117,000 per year in electricity costs and will reduce our electricity usage by over a million kilowatt hours per year.

Now, all we need is a legitimate viable supplier of renewable energy that will, number one, not contribute to the greenhouse gases that are warming our climate; number two, that will not have a harmful effect on our respiratory health; and, number three, will not prolong our dependence on foreign oil.

I had the pleasure of standing with some of the SOS people in line today, so I'm well aware of their concern and the fact that Cape Wind will likely be a very profitable venture. I'm well aware that they are probably capitalists and may even flip their turbines.

To that end, I say show me the

alternatives, what other renewable energy sources are being developed today that we can actually use today and not off in the distant future. This type of project is the only thing that works in this country. It is the only thing available to us today that will drive our consciousness around renewable energy, hopefully, will drive demand and will actually give us a supply of reliable green power.

I recently heard George Bush, Sr.'s, EPA director speak at Harvard, and he said, "Make no mistake about it. The cost of our dependence on oil is the cost of our Army, our Navy and our Air Force," and I ask, is that how we want to spend our tax dollars in this defensive mode defending our dependence on oil or would we rather use our tax dollars, spend them on the development of technologies and services that will take us into the next century.

So I want to say thank you to Cape Wind and thank you to the Army--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am-MARIA SIMONEAU: --Corps of Engineers.
MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Allison Field-Juma to be followed by Wolfe Springer.

ALLISON FIELD-JUMA: Thank you for this opportunity to speak. My name is Allison Field-Juma, and I represent Green Decade, Cambridge, a group of 167 Cambridge residents.

We would like to state our strong support for the Cape Wind project. We are environmental scientists, engineers, business people, property owners and others united by a concern about our health, our environment and the potentially catastrophic effects of global warming on our ecosystems and economy.

Massachusetts will feel the impacts of global warming and, in many cases, already is.

Our beaches will be submerged and many of our homes flooded. Insect-borne diseases will increase. The ranges for Sugar Maples and lobsters will shrink and so will the ski season. There's no doubt that this will affect our economy, our health and the beauty and tourist appeal of our state.

In Cambridge, we are investing in efficient power plants and green buildings and taking many other personal actions to reduce our energy use, but we all still consume vast amounts of energy from fossil fuels extracted from other parts of this country and politically unstable parts of the world, and we suffer the environmental and health consequences.

In this state, we struggle every year with soaring energy prices in winter and power shortages in the summer. We need clean steady sources of energy at predictable prices.

Massachusetts has very limited potential to generate its own power, but offshore wind can be a significant source of clean American made electricity. If we plan to continue using electricity at anything near current levels, we have to accept the responsibility to generate some of it. It's time to shoulder that responsibility.

We are very concerned that if the Cape
Wind project is not permitted in one of the
windiest and shallowest ocean areas on the East
Coast, efforts in Massachusetts and across the
country to combat global warming will be set back

by decades. Neither we, nor our children, have that time to waste.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our concerns.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Wolfe Springer.

MARION SPRINGER: I'm not Wolfe. I'm his wife. He sent me down as his emissary.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Would you, please, then say your first name for the record?

MARION SPRINGER: My first name is

Marion Springer. We've been sitting back there

listening to everything that's been said tonight,

and I have to admit that I'm speaking for myself.

I'm tremendously overwhelmed by the amount of interest and the amount of information which has been given here tonight. I don't think that either one of us could say anything above and beyond what's already been said. We have, of course, I'm from Falmouth. We live on the Cape, and we have a very, very deep feeling about the shoals, about that whole area.

So, it seems probably come across as a little bit self-centered that we would want to protect our shoals and have things done properly.

We feel, in this sense, my husband and I, that we really should have an extension of time for the review hearing that you're having by the end of the review hearing on February 24th or, better yet, a complete halt to the whole project until everything can be done through a national energy policy that's handled properly and legally.

We generally know, we know there have to be other forms of energy, and we're not saying we shouldn't have them, and we're aware of all the problems that you have spoken about tonight.

But we also would like to just say that we are certainly setting a precedent since this is our first time out in the water, and we want to be very, very careful in setting that precedent of turbines being built anywhere in the United States on the coast.

> MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am. MARION SPRINGER: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Lisa

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

Augusto who will be followed by Brigita Rasys.

LISA AUGUSTO: Hello. My name is Lisa
Augusto, and I'm actually a resident of Fall
River, Massachusetts, but tonight I'm actually
going to speak on behalf of my friend Jason
Sapienza, who's sitting up there, but is not going
to get to his number, so I'll read his statement.

"Hello. My name is Jason Sapienza, and I'm a student intern with the MASSPIRG student chapters. As students in Massachusetts, we recognize that our current energy policies are creating serious public health and environmental problems for citizens of Massachusetts that we will have to deal with when we run the state in the future.

"We believe that clean renewable energy is vital to our future. As a result, we feel that we should give Massachusetts students an opportunity to voice their opinion on the Cape Wind project. We have collected over 1,300 comments from students who support advancing the Cape Wind project.

"It is imperative that we reevaluate the way we produce energy. In Massachusetts, we see

the effects of global warming pollution every day.

Asthma rates are growing. Our sea levels are rising, and mercury pollution is contaminating our waterways and fish.

"These problems will only continue to get worse if we don't address them now. This is not the future Massachusetts students want. This is the future that we need and that we deserve," and I will now present the 1,300 public comments.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.

Next speaker, Brigita Rasys who will be followed by Michael Arquin. Ma'am?

SARAH HEDGES: Brigita Rasys had to leave. My name is Sarah Hedges. I'll be reading her comments.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you.

SARAH HEDGES: "Good evening. My name is Birgita Raziz. I live in Winchester, but all my life I've spent summers in Centerville. As a little girl, we would travel to the Centerville house on weekends and stay with my grandparents.

"As a teenager, I helped my grandparents at the home when it served as a guest home for

Lithuanian families, which is where my parents and grandparents immigrated from.

"Over the years, Cape Cod has become more developed. This has led to stricter rules for development of the remaining land on Cape Cod, and the Cape, in my opinion, is the better for those regulations.

"Perhaps, it is the young Dorchester girl in me speaking tonight, but I always believed that Nantucket Sound was off limits for developers. I took solace, even as a child, over the facts that you could look for miles into the Nantucket Sound and see nothing more than a fishing boat, a ferry or a sailboat moving across the horizon. That little girl has grown up, but now I have my own children who have the same appreciation for the unspoiled sanctuary that is Nantucket Sound.

"They asked me about this project and wondered how a government agency can just hand over the ocean to these turbines. I'm shocked and appalled at the notion that a private developer could simply occupy these waters for private profit because there are no laws that prevent him

from doing so.

"I'm fearful that the government I trust is losing its way on the issue and believes that it has more of an allegiance to this company than the millions of people and generations of citizens who have come to cherish Nantucket Sound. This project is all about one company's future, not ours. Even my children know the difference."

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Michael Arquin.

(No response.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: David Bergeron?

Oh, Mr. Arquin. Thank you. You'll be followed by David Bergeron.

MICHAEL O'LEKSAK: Thank you. Thank you for, thank you for this opportunity. My name is Michael O'Leksak (phonetic) from the nonprofit organization Save Popponesset Bay. Save Popponesset Bay was founded in 1987 to protect Popponesset Bay and, more recently, the Popponesset Spit, an endangered species habitat.

We work with Audubon, the Department of Environmental Protection, the Army Corps of Engineers and Mashpee Conservation. We will submit written comments on the DEIS by February 24th.

We are concerned about this industrialization so close to what we are working to preserve. We support a fast track policy to set rules and regulations for offshore development, solar and wind similar to gas and oil regulation.

We ask that Nantucket Sound not be simply cherry picked as the guinea pig for this massive industrial project. Why do we have to experiment with Nantucket Sound?

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,

David Bergeron followed by Colin Peppard. Sir?

DAVID BERGERON: Thank you. My name is

David Bergeron. I am the Executive Director of

the Massachusetts Fishermen's Partnership. I'm a

resident of Cape Ann, and I'm here this evening

representing the Board of Directors of our organization.

The Massachusetts Fishermen's

Partnership is an umbrella organization of

seventeen commercial fishing associations

representing all sectors of the Massachusetts

fishing industry. The organization was created to

promote the common interest and economic viability

of commercial fishermen and fishing families.

We have worked with social scientist

Dr. Madeleine Hall-Arbor and Dr. Rhonda Risner, of
the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, to
conduct a preliminary study of the dependents of
small scale commercial fisherman on Horseshoe
Shoal and assessment of the impacts upon
commercial fishing of the construction of the Cape
Wind Energy Project in Nantucket Sound.

The comments reported in the study show that commercial fishermen will be negatively impacted and not just inconvenienced by the construction of this facility. In addition, we believe that the Army Corps of Engineers is not the appropriate organization to conduct an assessment of the impacts of such a project on

essential fish habitat and marine fisheries.

This type of assessment needs to be conducted by an agency with appropriate technical expertise such as the National Marine Fisheries Service or the Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries.

For these reasons, which are described in more detail in our written statement and study which is attached, the fishermen's partnership is opposed to the approval of this project and urges the Army Corps to reject this application until proper impact assessments have been completed by appropriate agencies.

The Massachusetts Fishermen's

Partnership is very supportive of the development

of alternative renewable sources of energy which

do not contribute to greenhouse effects or

pollution, but we cannot support projects that may

provide some environmental benefits without a

proper assessment of the environmental impact such

projects may cause.

Proponents of this project must show through independent research that the public trust has been protected and that the requirements of

the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and 1 2 Managing Act--Thank you, sir--3 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: 4 DAVID BERGERON: --have been followed. 5 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you very 6 much. 7 (Applause.) MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Please be sure 8 9 your entire statement is submitted for the record. 10 Next speaker, Colin Peppard followed by 11 Aditya Nochur. Sir? 12 COLIN PEPPARD: Good evening. My name 13 is Colin Peppard, and I'm the energy policy associate with the Massachusetts Public Interest 14 15 Research Group, or MASSPIRG. We represent 50,000 members across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 16 17 and many of them were here tonight. I thank them for that. 18 19 I also thank the Army Corps for hosting 20 these hearings and considering these comments and look forward to submitting our comprehensive 21 written comments. 22 23 While we do look forward to submitting 24 these, I'm here tonight to rebut one of the main

claims by the opponents of the project. Many have claimed that the review process for evaluating the costs and benefits of the project are inadequate or somehow flawed.

MASSPIRG is often the first to point out flawed processes and other rubber stamp acrobatics from the state and federal government, and to be sure, the Army Corps has often been a target of criticism from MASSPIRG and other state PIRGs across the country.

With respect to Cape Wind, however, the Army Corps' review process is extraordinarily fair and thorough, and we commend you for that, and the developer's influence has not been an issue.

The process in place to review Cape
Wind is entirely adequate to address all of the
relevant environmental as socioeconomic concerns
associated with the proposed project while
highlighting the benefits as well.

We urge the Army Corps to continue to move forward expeditiously, and we strongly urge the project's opponents not to use any dubious procedural, legal or legislative maneuvering to try to try to unfairly kill this project, as they

have in the past.

The bottom line is that, without the renewable energy project of this size and scope, Massachusetts will not be able to meet the legislature's renewable energy mandates or the reductions in global warming pollution that Governor Romney has promised in his Climate Protection Plan.

MASSPIRG remains encouraged by the extremely positive Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and if all of our expectations are met, we look forward to endorsing the project in the future.

Thank you very much.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,
Aditya Nochur followed by Susan Swords.

ADITYA NOCHUR: Hello. My name is

Aditya Nochur. I'm a student at Tufts University.

I'm a resident of Newton, and I grew up right here
near MIT.

I know I wasn't sure if I'd be able to make it out here because of final exams, and I

know a lot of students like me are in the same boat, but I just want to make it clear that clean energy is a very important issue to us students.

As you heard from my friend, Jen
Baldwin, earlier, Tufts and dozens of other
schools across the country are pursuing clean
energy initiatives, and this fall, 27,000 students
across the country, including 3,000 from
Massachusetts, signed a Declaration of
Independence from Dirty Energy that's online at
energyaction.net. We support a clean energy
future, and Cape Wind is a part of that.

Now, most of the concerns that have been raised about the Cape Wind project are largely from people who are concerned about the aesthetics or the wildlife of the project. To these people I say, smoke stacks in poor minority communities are ugly. Pollution from coal burning power plants kill birds. Oil spills in the waters of Cape Cod kill birds and fish. House cat kill birds. I mean, come on.

Now, that said, Cape Wind would offset 82 million barrels worth of oil and one million tons of CO2 every year. It's not windmills, but

it's oil spills, global warming and air pollution 1 2 that are the true threats to the natural resources we all share and cherish, not to mention that 3 4 they're a threat to our very health and livelihoods. 5 It's my peers and fellow students who 6 7 are going to bear the brunt of these impacts down the line, and we ask you to do the right thing. 8 It's time for a clean energy revolution. 9 10 Thank you. 11 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. 12 (Applause.) 13 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, 14 Susan Swords who will be followed by Jason 15 Sapienza. FROM THE FLOOR: What number are we on 16 17 right now? MODERATOR ROSENBERG: One zero seven on 18 19 the total, eighty on the public speakers. 20 SUSAN SWORDS: Hi. My name is Susan 21 Swords, and I'm a resident of Cambridge, 22 Massachusetts. I'm also a summer resident of 23 Dennis, and I'm a member of Clean Power Now.

I'm employed by a project called CAMP,

24

which stands for Childhood Asthma Management

Project. It's a large multi-center study which

examines multiple aspects of asthma, including the

causes, possible preventions and cures.

The CAMP project has produced many scientific papers, including a recent study published in 2003, which proves that there's an undeniable association between increasing air pollution and asthma attacks on any given day.

On days which air quality is worse, as measured by the EPA's air quality index, both, the number of attacks increase and, also, the severity of the symptoms increases.

Currently, asthma accounts for approximately 40 percent of all pediatric emergency room and urgent care visits, so I would strongly encourage all parents and health care providers who have to deal with this tragedy every day to support the Cape Wind project.

And in response to the comment that was made earlier about the trading caps, I feel like that's kind of an unfair thing to say because, obviously, the trading caps are something that -- or the trading credits, I'm not really sure how

that works. I think those are, obviously, an important way to go about reducing air pollution, but I don't think that it's fair to say it's the best or the only way to go about using those trading credits to reduce air pollution.

I think that is just one piece of the puzzle, and I think Cape Wind is a piece of the puzzle, and I think they're both important, but you can't say that one is more important than the other.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.
(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,

Jason Sapienza followed by Susan Altman.

JASON SAPIENZA: Hi. I'm Jason
Sapienza. I don't know if I actually can speak
because Lisa actually spoke for me just a moment
ago because we didn't think I would get up in
time. Am I still allowed to speak on it?

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: You're on.

JASON SAPIENZA: Okay. Hi. I'm Jay
Sapienza. I'm an intern with the MASSPIRG student
organization. I'm for the wind farm. I had a

speech prepared, but it's kind of already been said now, so, you know, this wind farm's a great thing.

I've heard people opposed to it and for it. Actually, my grandparents were, for a long time, they've been very opposed to this. They don't live on the Cape. They actually live in Woburn, and it's very interesting to me because, for some reason or another, they're just very set on not having this wind farm for the longest time, and then I became involved in MASSPIRG and I started learning about this wind farm, and I started actually talking to them about it, and then took it up themselves, without anybody asking or without anybody even knowing really, to learn more about it.

As time went on, their views slowly drifted from being avidly against this to being avidly for it, and it's just an amazing thing how a little bit of education, how once you give people the tools and knowledge to understand something, that they'll actually listen and make up and make educated assumptions and bases on what they've learned.

And I'm just hoping that this public 1 2 comment period and that these reports that come out help more people learn more about it and make 3 4 educated decisions on it, and, hopefully, it will be for the better. 5 6 Thank you. 7 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. 8 (Applause.) 9 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, 10 Susan Altman followed by James Clark. Altman? 11 12 (No response.) 13 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: James Clark? 14 Mr. Clark will be followed by Stephen Kaiser. 15 Sir? JAMES CLARK: I'm James Clark, a 16 17 resident of Harvard, and I'm here just representing myself. I want to compliment the 18 19 Corps of Engineers on this Draft Environmental 20 Impact Statement, and I'm glad it was released 21 before the discouragement of the recent Army/Navy 22 game. 23 I think, as I've reviewed things, I

believe most of the opponents, my personal opinion

24

is that they are opposed based on aesthetic reasons. Personally, myself, I am for it. I like viewing wind turbines, and I would like to see a whole farm of wind turbines, but that's my personal opinion.

I will file a statement here provided by me, as an engineer, but I think the most significant comment is I thank God that my family does not have any health issues due to conventional power plants. People here have testified from personal experience to those. I'm just fortunate enough not to suffer them.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

16 | MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,

17 | Stephen Kaiser--

18 | STEPHEN KAISER: Right here--

19 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: --followed by

20 Peter Kane. Sir?

STEPHEN KAISER: Okay. I am an MIT trained engineer who, for eight years, was also a school teacher, and I remember this little first grade boy speaking to his buddy saying, let's play

let's pretend, and they got together, and they spun it out with all this imagination, let's pretend.

Now, what's the relevance to tonight's affair? Let me make the connection. Let's pretend we could not see the windmills, that they were invisible. The Governor's objections would disappear. Most of my objections would disappear, and I think, at least, half of the critics would find that their objections would disappear because we would not have to see those 40 story windmills.

So I think the issue of aesthetics and scale is absolutely vital here, and it has been handled very poorly in this EIS. My quick view of the document is it's incomplete. This summary has only one short paragraph in there about scale and aesthetics.

What are we going to do to be able to solve this issue? We can't turn to MEPA, unfortunately. I've watched them for 25 years. They don't scope for scale and aesthetics. There's no experts, there's no permits, no understanding of this.

We can't turn to the architects. They

deal in structures and appearance and scale. They fail. They get out of scale. They produce ugly buildings. They won't help us. The lawyers, the CLF memo that was handed around today, that makes no reference whatsoever to appearance. In that whole little handout, no reference to appearance.

So here we have this vital issue which is missed. The lawyers can't help us, the architects can't help us. Who gets to make the decision? It's the engineers, the Army Corps of Engineers. They get stuck having to deal with this crucial issue, and it's very vital, and all I can say, Colonel, is, I have my greatest respect for you, and I wish you the best because it's a tough task.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

19 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,

Peter Kane?

(No response.)

22 | MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Jonathan Haughton?

23 Mr. Haughton will be followed by Bernard

24 Gallagher.

JONATHAN HAUGHTON: My name is Jonathan Haughton. I'm the principal author of a cost benefit analysis of the Cape Wind project submitted to the Army Corps in May by the Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University.

Presidential Executive Order 12866 of 1993 states that, "Each agency shall propose or adopt a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that the benefits of the intended regulation justify its costs."

Although comments on costs and benefits ought to be found scattered throughout the Draft EIS, the report does not weigh the costs against the benefits, but I do. Based on the available facts, the wind farm project fails a cost benefit test of the kind in visage by the presidential executive order.

We estimate the economic cost of the project to be 9.06 cents per kilowatt hour of electricity, very close to the figure in the Draft EIS, but this is expensive, far higher than the 6.3 cents I paid on my last NStar bill, but wind power has virtues.

We estimate the economic benefits of

electricity generated by Cape Wind to be 7.06 cents. This breaks down into fuel savings of 4.95 cents, and this takes into the account the likelihood of periods of high energy prices in the future, capital operating savings of .98 cents, health savings due to reduced emissions which we quantify at 1.02 cents per kilowatt hour.

We believe that the Draft EIS overstates these benefits ten-fold. And greater energy independence, which we quantify at .10 cents per kilowatt hour. I note, by the way, that when complete, this project would provide slightly under 1 percent to the electricity generated in New England.

A private firm, of course, is interested in doing this only because of the subsidies which we put at--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir-JONATHAN HAUGHTON: --4.04 cents.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. Make sure your entire statement is submitted for the record.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,

Bernard Gallagher who will be followed by Ernie Corrigan.

BERNIE GALLAGHER: Hi. My name is

Bernie Gallagher. I'm not affiliated with any
organization. I've come here today from New York
City because I care about the consequences if a
wind farm is allowed on Nantucket Sound.

To me, it's a humanities issue. I'm an avid student of history and theory, and I agree with the hypothesis that the conditions in and around Nantucket Sound are the best explanation to account for a story going back to a period in Iceland. I'm referring to the Vinland sagas mentioned earlier tonight and by others in the past.

Memories are integrally related to narratives. Trustworthy narratives can be verified. I believe in our ability to get the story straight. Nantucket Sound is not a good site to experiment. I invite Cape Wind to come to New York, but let's not start a new narrative, one that would refer back to actions taken to change the nature of Nantucket Sound.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

its current state.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,
Ernie Corrigan followed by Richard Vanderslice.

ERNIE CORRIGAN: Good evening. My name is Ernie Corrigan.

Over the past two years, the Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound has conducted an education and grassroots campaign to inform the public about the real impacts of this project and to engage residents and visitors to Cape Cod and the Islands on the importance of protecting Nantucket Sound in

During the course of that campaign, we have gathered signatures from concerned citizens in the form of a petition asking the Army Corps of Engineers to deny Cape Wind a permit to construct this energy plan in the middle of Nantucket Sound.

with over 10,000 names on those petitions, and when the veracity of those of names were

21 challenged by advocates for this project, we

undertook a process to examine the signatures and

remove questionable and duplicative names.

We then continued to gather signatures,

Last winter, we presented the Army Corps

and tonight, we would like to formally present over 11,000 signatures from those petitions asking the Army Corps of Engineers to reject the permit sought by Cape Wind.

These 11,000 names represent tens of thousands of other residents and visitors to the Cape and Islands who are, likewise, opposed to this project, and while we appreciate that your task is not to judge a popularity contest, these names also substantially represent the true owners of Horseshoe Shoals and Nantucket Sound.

They're the people who pay taxes and support the government you serve, and their voices, while not raising technical arguments tonight regarding the DEIS, are nonetheless the voices of the governed who are looking to you to protect their heartfelt opposition.

I would like to ask the Army Corps to enter these names as part of it's official record.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,

24 | Richard Vanderslice?

(No response.)

_

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Joy Marzolf who will be followed by Lincoln Baxter. Ma'am?

JOY MARZOLF: My name is Joy Marzolf.

I'm from North Falmouth, Mass., and I've been an environmental educator for the last five years.

Like children grading their own papers, having industry respond to the research for this environmental report is a complete conflict of interest. Like children giving themselves an A, much of the information in the DEIS was written by those with a vested interest in this wind farm.

I ask that the Army Corps of Engineers take a few steps back in this process. There are still many unanswered issues and questions regarding this project, technical, economic and environmental.

Studies of the impact on these turbines on bats and birds, including endangered species, are incomplete or nonexistent. Use of land bird kill numbers of flawed. Each habitat is decidedly different. Impact to area wildlife by aircraft lighting, vibrations through the water and low frequency sounds is actually unknown and does not

seem to be stated.

Land-based studies in the U.K. have indicated significant impact to wildlife. True impact on vital fish nurseries and area bio diversity through changes in water flow and direct impact to the sea floor is not adequately addressed.

There's still no oil spill plan for the terminal's 40,000 plus gallons. Issues of ice accumulation on turbines and the resulting structural damage and failure of the turbines has not been fully addressed. This has been a major in other turbines. No immediate plans for escrow money to remove the towers if the company goes bankrupt or the towers are damaged, such as by common hurricanes in this area, has been set up as of this time. Money needs to be in escrow prior to construction.

In Denmark, with the largest offshore wind parks in the world, they have only 80 turbines in one single area in one event, and they have had significant technical problems from, both, ice and salt. This has not been fully addressed.

Why should the Northeast's first large wind farm be based in a unique and complex ocean environment before establishing pilot programs with land-based projects? Too many unanswered questions. Engineers are trained that, in order to make a correct decision, they must first have accurate and sufficient information, which is lacking in this case.

I ask that you, the Army Corps of Engineers, find against this particular project because we are lacking so much vital information.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,
Lincoln Baxter who will be followed by Audrey
Schulman.

LINCOLN BAXTER: Good evening. My name is Lincoln Baxter. I come from thirteen generations of Cape Codders, and I live in Centerville, Mass., and I'm wearing a green shirt to support renewable energy.

My ancestors were sea captains and dentists. They were founders of the Town of Dennis. They were millers as well. They built

the Baxter Gristmill in the Town of Yarmouth.

They used their own money. They built it on their own land. I believe that mill is a symbol of where we should be building wind farms, right in our own backyard.

I want renewable energy, and I want it in my backyard. To optimize the efficiency of such projects, we need to locate them as close to the existing infrastructure as possible. Modify or replace the towers that support the power lines to accommodate the generators. There will be no transmission loss, and maintenance costs will be far lower.

Why was this not considered as a potential site? We could put far more than 130 turbines along the power lines of the Cape.

I've been sailing all my life and much of that time in Nantucket Sound. The vast majority of vessels that navigate the sound can safely navigate over 95 percent of Horseshoe Shoals. It's a highly trafficked area. It can be difficult to locate a buoy or navigational aid in the distance during the daylight hours, let alone at night.

How can the EIS find that there would be no significant impact on the safety of navigation? Buoys and navigational aids will be extremely difficult to locate either in or on the far side of a maze of towers and flashing lights. This poses significant hazards to navigation and should be considered very carefully in the process.

If an offshore site is best, then pick a site where it has infrequent traffic, such as South of Nantucket, East of Monomoy. These are just as windy as Horseshoe Shoals. We need renewable energy. Let's just make sure we pick the best way overall to achieve these goals, not just jump on the band wagon of the first big proposal that comes along.

Thank you very much.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

19 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,

Audrey Schulman.

(No response.)

22 | MODERATOR ROSENBERG: David Shakespeare.

23 Mr. Shakespeare will be followed by Rob Bussiere.

24 || Sir?

DAVID SHAKESPEARE: Good evening, and thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts on why I support the proposed Cape Wind project. My name is David Shakespeare, and I live in Melrose, Massachusetts.

We need renewable energy projects like
Cape Wind for four reasons: pollution, terrorism,
regulatory requirements and economic development.

Air pollution caused by emissions from fossil fuel burning power plants is leading to increases in respiratory and coronary illnesses in sensitive populations in the Northeast, including the residents of the Cape and the Islands.

These same power plants are also major emitters of carbon dioxide, one of the prime greenhouse gases that lead to global warming.

Cape Wind would not emit any greenhouse gases or other harmful pollutants. Our dependence on oil is driving our country into alliances with foreign countries with horrible records on human rights, and the profits for the oil sales have been liked with terrorist activities.

Cape Wind would add diversity to the New England energy supply, thus, adding some energy

security, and it would help wean us from reliance on foreign oil. Massachusetts has committed to increasing its use of renewable energy by establishing a renewable energy portfolio standard, or RPS.

The RPS requires that 4 percent of the state's energy use come from renewable sources by 2009. Currently, only 1 percent of our energy comes from renewable energy. Cape Wind would make a significant contribution toward helping us meet our RPS goal.

Finally, I believe Cape Wind has the potential to help Massachusetts become a world leader in offshore wind farm technology.

Companies such as General Electric have stated that they believe wind farms have the potential to become a multi-billion dollar growth industry in the near future. Now is the time for Massachusetts to embrace this exciting new technology by supporting the Cape Wind project.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker, Rob

Bussiere followed by Roderic Baltz.

ROB BUSSIERE: Good evening. My name is Rob Bussiere. I'm from Cape Cod, and I represent Wind Stop, a grassroots citizens' organization interested in the preservation and opposed to the industrialization of Nantucket Sound.

I speak tonight on behalf of Nantucket Sound because Nantucket Sound can't speak for itself. I, personally, am sick and tired of being called anti-American and a NIMBY because I'm from Cape Cod. I've worked hard to help that place exist and develop since 1975.

I couldn't help, while coming up here, looking at the traffic on the highway about all the exhaust emissions that I could see there. You know, some people ought to think about their choices of transportation, look at the SUVs you drive and maybe change that a little bit and get rid of those emissions.

Anyway, I want to address the DEIS and a few points that I found lacking. I'd like the Army Corps of Engineers to include in the DEIS the report of the British Defense Ministry on the effects wind turbines have on radar as it relates

to aviation safety.

Two, reevaluate requiring the project to be land based so as not to prohibit the expeditious search and rescue operations of the Coast Guard for mariners in distress on Nantucket Sound.

No matter where the site is proposed, use legacy wind speed data from that site to produce accurate calculations of generated power. Consider the negative impact this project will have on the tourism industry of the Cape and Islands by the creation of one of the top twenty tallest sky lines in the world, 4.7 miles off the coast of Cape Cod.

Extend the public comment period to June of 2005 in order to allow all Cape and Island residents, winter and summer, an opportunity to comment on the DEIS.

In closing, I'd like to say that I am not surprised at the concerns that the Cape and Islands residents opposed to the industrialization of Nantucket Sound being minimalized by the proponents, as was displayed tonight in the form of sophomoric hallway theater and gratuitous song.

From day one, these concerns have been dismissed as NIMBY. Well, I, for one, am not prepared to hand over Nantucket Sound to a private developer for profit. It's not the view; it's not the vision. It's the money. Nantucket Sound is not for sale.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

Next speaker, Roderic Baltz who will be

followed by Shareen Davis.

RODERIC BALTZ: Thank you very much for listening to all this, and thank you for giving me an opportunity going beyond your shutoff time.

I have something to contribute, I hope, for you. I do have an engineering degree. I'd like to assure everybody, I don't think there's anyone here who isn't, but just to reassure anybody why I fully appreciate the value of renewable energy.

I appreciate the threat of global warming. All of these are real things, and I want to submit to you that Cape Wind is not the sole panacea for all of this. We know that, but you're talking relative values here. That's what you're

speaking of, and in my case, I would like to say that, just as the man said at the outset tonight, the negatives outweigh the positives as far as Horseshoe Shoal is concerned and Nantucket Sound is concerned.

I've had, I live around here, and I have an outsider's appreciation of Cape Cod, you might say. I have a summer place in Falmouth. There appear to be a number of people here tonight from Falmouth, and if you're in Falmouth, you're not playing NIMBY. You're not worried about a view, and it's not exactly aesthetics either.

But people can think of value. I've had, for 35 years now, I've had a boat. I don't mean a 40 foot Hetaeras or anything like that. It's a 16-foot Old Town lap straight with a 65 Merc on the back, and I take this boat, as I have with my family for some 20, 25 years, and we make the run, it's maybe 35, 45 minutes in good small boat weather, down to Horseshoe Shoal.

FROM THE FLOOR: Time.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

RODERIC BALTZ: I'm sorry.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Please be sure your entire statement is submitted for the record.

Next speaker, Shareen Davis.

SHAREEN DAVIS: Good evening. My name is Shareen Davis, and I'm a Cape Cod resident who traveled here this evening with a group of other people from Cape Cod, and I must say that I attended all three of the public hearings held on the Cape and Islands, and a majority of the Cape Cod residents resoundedly spoke and had serious concerns over this project.

The DEIS mentions minimal impacts to the fishing during construction. Nantucket Sound is host to long-finned or lologos squid during the spring months, and spawning activity occurs during that time. Squid eggs and the developing juveniles are important constituents to the ecosystem food web base, become prey for other species. Squid possess a sensitive nervous system.

How will a large electromagnetic field generated by the wind turbines and the heat generated by the electrical transmission cables

affect squid activity and the underwater spawning grounds?

If the population were to decline in Nantucket Sound because of the negative effect of electromagnetic fields on squid activity, including the spawning, what effect will that have on the entire ecosystem of this area?

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.
(Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,
Stuart Swan to be followed by Frances Dalmolen.

STUART SWAN: Good evening. Stuart Swan, a resident of Chatham.

Horseshoe Shoal is a mound of sand, loose sand, saturated by seawater. It covers an area, roughly, six times the size of Cambridge, and it reaches the height of the top of this building.

This is a very unstable pile of sand.

It is a sandbar. You can penetrate Horseshoe

Shoal with a fire hose. There is really no

substance to it, and it has maintained its

position through history for the last couple

hundred years because of the balance of nature and

the equilibrium which it exists in.

If Cape Wind builds on this very sensitive pile of sand, you're going to create eddies all over and around this body of sand, and this body of sand is going to begin to move. You have currents going over it and around it 24 hours a day reaching speeds of one mile and hour and close to two miles an hour. This will create enormous eddies around the foundations of this industrial complex, and Horseshoe Shoal will begin to disappear.

As Horseshoe Shoal begins to disappear, you will destabilize Nantucket Sound. You will start to reconfigure the main channel, the North channel and all of the other sandbars surrounding it.

Here is the possible disaster. You may shoal over Vineyard Haven Harbor strangling the economic viability of Martha's Vineyard because shipping will not be able to enter the harbor. You may very well strangle, and you may, through all of this hydraulics, you may find that Tuckernuck Shoal begins to grow, and now Nantucket is landlocked. The shipping cannot enter or leave

Nantucket. Perhaps in a small cad boat with a board up.

Let's go over to Hyannis. The channel going into Hyannis is no deeper than the height from that exit sign to the floor. It's, roughly, 12 to 14 feet--

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. (Applause.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Next speaker,

Frances Dalmolen who will be followed by Diane
Roderick.

FRANCES DALMOLEN: Hi. My name is Frances Dalmolen. I've summered on the Cape all of my life, and I'm now a year-round resident of Chatham.

Like many, I have come to oppose this particular project, and I must say, I am disappointed that supporters of the wind farm keep wanting to delegitimize the concerns of those who want to save the sound and reduce it to simply a matter of aesthetics.

Let me assure you our concerns are much more substantive than just visuals. Let me address, particularly, two points. One, building

an industrial-sized wind farm in the middle of Nantucket Sound is, in fact, like building a wind farm along the rim of the Grand Canyon.

The sound is a beautiful natural resource which must be protected and preserved for the enjoyment of everyone living on the Cape, as well as for those just visiting.

To believe that the wind farm will cause no significant harm to the birds, to marine life, to the ecosystem or the fishing industry is to engage in wishful thinking.

Secondly, Nantucket Sound is not a safe place to build the proposed wind farm for climatic reasons. Do you really think a Hurricane Bob or a winter Nor'easter such as that that broke through the Barrier Beach in Chatham would not create havoc with these manmade structures?

Do we really want to risk an oil spill from the platform? Once the sound has been spoiled by the wind farm, it'll be difficult and perhaps take years, if ever, to undo the damage caused by the unforeseen.

Who thought the Big Dig would spring hundreds of leaks before it was completed? Things

	257							
1	that are not planned for or predicted happen.							
2	Accidents happen. Do we need to cut pollution?							
3	Yes, absolutely. Let's start by conserving energy							
4	and reducing the number of SUVs on the road.							
5	Thank you.							
6	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am.							
7	(Applause.)							
8	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Sir, it's now							
9	11:30 p.m., and we do have to vacate at midnight.							
10	May I suggest that we, after this speaker, we							
11	recess and reconvene at a later date?							
12	How many individuals in the hall are							
13	still waiting to speak?							
14	FROM THE FLOOR: I want to speak. I've							
15	been here since five. I want							
16	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: We cannot							
17	accommodate them.							
18	FROM THE FLOOR: One minute.							
19	MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Ma'am?							
20	DIANE RODERICK: Hi.							
21	FROM THE FLOOR: Go to one minute. I'm							
22	serious.							
23	DIANE RODERICK: My name is Diane							
24	Roderick, and I was born and raised on Cape Cod,							

and I am speaking for myself, and I am against the wind farm on Nantucket Sound.

I'm one of those people that don't like to go over the bridge very much. Maybe it's because of the love I have for my home, Cape Cod, and it breaks my heart at the thought of making a power plant out of Nantucket Sound.

I am aware of the needs we have for alternative power, and the offshore wind farm is a realistic one. The only problem I do have is the fact that it will be the first of its kind in the U.S., and it is still at its experimental stage.

Although the impact statement states there are no real threats to the ecosystem of Nantucket Sound, this is based on short-term studies. I only wish you would spend some more time on testing the area before initiating such a large scale project.

I noticed in the impact statement the first application had included 170 turbines, and the most recent one calls for 130. If you were able to scale it down in that little time, how do we know that it can't be scaled down to even less? The way technology is always changing, maybe by

the time it is built, we would only need 50. 1 Who 2 knows? I am for the idea of renewable energy. 3 4 I only wish for an alternative location to put this facility. We need to remember that once the 5 damage is done, it's done. It's important to make 6 7 sure this developer has the right intentions in all aspects of the word "conservation." 8 9 It would be a shame to see anything 10 happen to the natural pristine beauty of Nantucket 11 Sound and it surrounding areas. 12 Thank you. 13 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, ma'am. 14 (Applause.) 15 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Ladies and 16 gentlemen, I'm sorry to say we have to vacate this 17 facility by twelve, and there are still many of 18 you that still need to speak. 19 FROM THE FLOOR: One minute, one minute. 20 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Ladies and 21 gentlemen, I'm sorry, we have to actually vacate 22 the premises by--

23

24

FROM THE FLOOR: We'll do it fast.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Ladies and

gentlemen, Colonel Koning.

COL. KONING: We've heard a great many thoughtful statements this evening. Since we are prevented from continuing because of time restrictions, and there are several of you who still wish to speak and signed up, but have not been called to the microphone, we're going to have to close this hearing at this time and reconvene at a time in the future in a place that will be determined later.

Those of you who have signed up to speak this evening, but were not called and, therefore, prevented as a result of the time restrictions will be contacted individually by mail with the date and location to give your statements.

With regards to the statements we've already received this evening, a careful analysis will be required before a determination can be made and a decision rendered. Written statements may be submitted to the Corps until February 24, 2005. These written statements will receive equal weight with those we heard here this evening. Each question or issue raised will be addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

We, at the Corps, extend our appreciation to all of those that took the time to involve themselves in this public process review.

And, finally, before I conclude this hearing, I'd like to extend my appreciation to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for the use of their facility this evening, to the MIT Campus Police Department for their support and, most of all, I'd like to thank you to provide us with your thoughts, your comments and your concerns.

Good evening.

(Applause.)

(Whereupon, at 11:35 p.m., December 16, 2004, the above hearing was concluded.)

	S	U	В	Μ	I	S	S	Ι	0	N

2 | Index Card/Petition

Approximately 1370 submitted. Record to be supplemented with complete list of names.

Text on card follows:

Dear Karen K. Adams, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
Cape Wind Energy Project Manager,

Massachusetts gets about 90% of its energy from dirty, dangerous sources like coal, oil, and nuclear power. These sources are a danger to our environment and to public health. Asthma is on the rise in the Bay State, women and children are advised not to eat certain types of fish because of mercury pollution, and there is no safe way to dispose of nuclear waste. Alternatives must be found. Massachusetts can set an example for the rest of the US and develop the first off-shore wind farm if we proceed carefully. Wind power is a sound choice for Massachusetts' energy future.

I urge you to ensure a prompt, fair, and thorough review process for the Cape Wind project.

APEX Reporting (617) 426-3077

1 Petition

Approximately 11,000 names submitted. Record to be supplemented with complete list of names.

Text on petition follows:

We, the undersigned, oppose the industrialization of Nantucket Sound, a public resource, by private developers who want to install one hundred thirty wind massive wind turbines to build one of the world's largest offshore wind power plants near the shores of Cape Cod.

We oppose this unprecedented private takeover of a precious public natural resource. We oppose the installaton of these massive turbine towers in the path of boats and aircraft. We oppose the location of this industrial machinery in the middle of one of America's largest migratory bird routes. This project will destroy one of the Cape's most cherished areas of natural beauty and have lasting negative effects on our local economy and environment.

We call upon state and federal authorities and the

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to deny all permits
for this wind power plant in Nantucket Sound. We
also seek a national policy governing the bidding
process and siting requirements for offshore wind
power projects on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Please return this petition to: The Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound, 396 Main St,. Suite 2, Hyannis, MA 02601 508.775.9767

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER AND TRANSCRIBER

This is to certify that the attached proceedings

in the Matter of:

RE: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

CAPE WIND ENERGY PROJECT

NANTUCKET SOUND, MASSACHUSETTS

Place: Cambridge, Massachusetts

Date: December 16, 2004

were held as herein appears, and that this is the true, accurate and complete transcript prepared from the notes and/or recordings taken of the above entitled proceeding.

<u>Jeffrey Mocanu</u> <u>December 16, 2004</u>

Reporter Date

Susan Hayes January 3, 2005

Transcriber Date

APEX Reporting (617) 426-3077